Very Important

CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

CONSIDERATION OF VARIOUS PROPOSALS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

DECEMBER 16 AND 17, 1960
EASTHAM, MASSACHUSETTS

Serial No. 28

Printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
63835 WASHINGTON : 1961

c.2 } storage
c.3

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado, *Chairman*

LEO W. O'BRIEN, New York
WALTER ROGERS, Texas
GRACIE PFOST, Idaho
JAMES A. HALEY, Florida
ADAM C. POWELL, New York
ED EDMONDSON, Oklahoma
B. F. SISK, California
STEWART L. UDALL, Arizona
J. T. RUTHERFORD, Texas
WALTER S. BARING, Nevada
AL ULLMAN, Oregon
LeROY H. ANDERSON, Montana
D. S. (JUDGE) SAUND, California
DONALD F. McGINLEY, Nebraska
THOMAS G. MORRIS, New Mexico
RALPH J. RIVERS, Alaska
WM. J. RANDALL, Missouri
ROY A. TAYLOR, North Carolina

JOHN P. SAYLOR, Pennsylvania
J. ERNEST WHARTON, New York
E. Y. BERRY, South Dakota
JACK WESTLAND, Washington
CRAIG HOSMER, California
J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Colorado
GARDNER R. WITHROW, Wisconsin
BOB WILSON, California
GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska
ODIN LANGEN, Minnesota
EDNA (Mrs. SID) SIMPSON, Illinois
JOHN KYL, Iowa

A. FERNÓS-ISERN, Puerto Rico
(Resident Commissioner)

Subcommittee on Public Lands

GRACIE PFOST, Idaho, *Chairman*

J. T. RUTHERFORD, Texas
WALTER S. BARING, Nevada
AL ULLMAN, Oregon
LeROY H. ANDERSON, Montana
D. S. (JUDGE) SAUND, California
RALPH J. RIVERS, Alaska
WM. J. RANDALL, Missouri

JOHN P. SAYLOR, Pennsylvania
J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Colorado
GARDNER R. WITHROW, Wisconsin
GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska
ODIN LANGEN, Minnesota
EDNA (Mrs. SID) SIMPSON, Illinois
JOHN KYL, Iowa

T. Richard Witmer, *Counsel*

Karl S. Landstrom, *Consultant on Public Lands*

CONTENTS

Statement of— Page

Nestor A. Aalto, Massachusetts Council of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc 173
Victor F. Adams, chairman, Board of Selectmen, Barnstable, Mass 137
Mary Cecil Allen, Provincetown, Mass 100
Walcott Ames, president, Barnstable County National Bank, Hyannis, Mass 139
A. Osborn Ball, secretary, Provincetown Civic Association, Provincetown, Mass 113
Van Ness Bates, Massachusetts Improvement Association, Boston, Mass 71
The Honorable Edward P. Boland, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts 10
Fritz Bultman, Provincetown Property Owner's Protective Association, Provincetown, Mass 118
The Honorable James A. Burke, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts 111
Serge Chermayeff, professor of architecture, Harvard University 101
Mrs. Walter P. Chrysler, Jr., North Truro, Mass 176
Norman Cook, executive secretary, Cape Cod Chamber of Commerce 66
The Honorable Silvio O. Conte, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts 8
Bertram Courier 181
Chester A. Crocker, Barnstable, Mass 127
George L. Cross, selectman, Barnstable, Mass 123
Prescott B. Cummings, chairman, Planning Board, Eastham, Mass 141
Josephine Del Deo, Provincetown, Mass 144
Mrs. Miriam Hapgood DeWitt, Provincetown, Mass 147
Charles H. W. Foster, commissioner of natural resources, Commonwealth of Massachusetts 15
Charles E. Frazier, chairman of selectmen, Wellfleet, Mass 41
Alice Hiscock, member, Chatham Planning Board, Chatham, Mass 178
Irving A. Horton, chairman of selectmen, Truro, Mass 32
Prince H. Hurd, Jr., selectman, Eastham, Mass 36
The Honorable Hastings Keith, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts 4
The Honorable John F. Kennedy, a U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts, as presented by Fred Holborn, assistant to the Senator 14
The Honorable Thos. J. Lane, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts 9
Werner Lieb, Truro, Mass 159
Rev. E. B. Luscombe, Wellfleet, Mass 135
Henry Lyman, publisher, Boston, Mass 154
Robert A. McNeece, selectman, town of Chatham 25
Ross Moffett, Provincetown, Mass 150
Allen Morgan, executive vice president, Audubon Society, Wayland, Mass 74
Franklin S. Murray, selectman, Orleans, Mass 33
Donald W. Nicholson, former Congressman from the State of Massachusetts 11
Maude H. and Edward R. Noyes 111
Joshua A. Nickerson, Orleans, Mass 60
The Honorable Leverett Saltonstall, a U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts, as delivered by Jonathan Moore, assistant to the Senator 14

Statement of—Continued

Page
Dr. George Shattuck, Massachusetts representative, Nature Conservancy, Brookline, Mass ---- 70
John C. Snow, chairman, selectmen, Provincetown, Mass ---- 47
Harry Taylor, North Eastham, Mass ---- 161
Orin Tovrov, Orleans, Mass ---- 157
Kenneth Turner, Cotuit, Mass ---- 133
Jack Tworkov, Provincetown, Mass ---- 151
John A. Volpe, Governor-elect, State of Massachusetts ---- 10
Heaton Vorse, Provincetown, Mass ---- 99
Mary Heaton Vorse, Provincetown, Mass ---- 116
Mrs. M. R. Werner, Provincetown, Mass ---- 153
Mrs. LeRoy Wiles, Wellfleet, Mass ---- 174
Dr. Madeline Winslow, Truro, Mass ---- 130
Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service, as presented by Ben H. Thompson, Chief, Recreational Resources Planning Division, National Park Service, accompanied by Frank Harrison, special assistant to the Director, NPS, and Ronald F. Lee, Region V, NPS, Philadelphia, Pa ---- 83

Material submitted for the record—

Massachusetts Division, American Automobile Association, letter from Richard W. Hoover, secretary-treasurer ---- 185
Charles L. Ayling, Barnstable, statement of ---- 185
Walcott Ames, president, the Barnstable County National Bank of Hyannis, Mass ---- 188
Emmet B. Baker, president, Massachusetts Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc ---- 110, 185
William W. Ball, Rear Adm., USNR (ret.). New Bedford, Mass., letter and proposals from ---- 186
Barnstable Town Hall, Hyannis, Mass., resolution of ---- 189
Barnstable County Commissioners, Hyannis, Mass., telegram from ---- 190
Francis A. T. Beane, Chatham, Mass., letter from ---- 190
George J. Bisacca, president, Eastover, Inc., Lenox, Mass., letter from ---- 192
W. S. Brewster, vice president, United Shoe Machinery Corp., Boston, Mass., letter from ---- 193
Selectmen of Brewster, Brewster, Mass., letter from ---- 193
Robert R. R. Brooks, dean, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., letter from ---- 193
John Burbank, Pittsfield, Mass., letter from ---- 194
Stanley E. Charm, Sc. D., Newton, Mass., letter from ---- 194
Clarence M. Chase, Hyannis, Mass., telegram from ---- 110
Edward F. Chellel, O.D., Warren, R.I., letter from ---- 194
Chatham Planning Board, Chatham, Mass., letter from ---- 195
Selectmen, Town of Chatham, Massachusetts, letter from ---- 195
Chatham Park Department, Chatham, Mass., letter from ---- 198
Dorothy and John Conkey, Ware, Mass., letter from ---- 199
Chester A. Crosby, Osterville, Mass., telegram from ---- 110
John M. Deely, chairman of the board, Lee Lime Corp., Lee, Mass., letter from ---- 199
Robert A. Dinerstein, village president, Park Forest, Ill., letter from ---- 200
Howard A. Dodge, letter from, presented by J. Benjamin Simmons, attorney, Washington, D.C ---- 200
J. Edward Downes, Jr., treasurer, Downes Lumber Co., letter from ---- 202
Henry A. Dymsza, Ph. D., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., statement of ---- 202
Charles W. Eliot, Cambridge, Mass., letter from ---- 203
Warren A. Ellsworth, comptroller, the Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass., letter from ---- 206
Emmanuel College, Department of Biology, Boston, Mass., statement ---- 206
Ralph W. Goodrich, superintendent of schools, Amherst, Mass., letter from ---- 206
Cecil I. Goodspeed, Osterville, Mass., telegram from ---- 111
Peter Hallock, Touisset, Mass., letters from ---- 198, 207
Richard P. Harding, Waltham, Mass., letter from ---- 208
Irving C. Henderson, Chatham, Mass., letter from ---- 209
Katherine A. Heberton, Chatham, Mass., letter from ---- 208
Truman Henson, New York, N.Y., letter from ---- 209

Material submitted for the record—Continued

Page
Earle F. Hiscock, Chatham, Mass., letter from 211
Channing E. Hoxie, town clerk, Sandwich, Mass., telegram from 111
Eugene Jackson, Brooklyn, N.Y., letter from 212
Frederick H. Jewell, Eastham, Mass., letter from 212
Mr. and Mrs. Robert S. Levy, Cincinnati, Ohio, letter from 213
Robert L. Loud, Cambridge, Mass., letter from 213
Allison W. Marsh, Amherst, Mass., letter from 214
Massachusetts Conservation Council, Massachusetts, statement of 214
Benjamin F. Miller, M.D., associate professor of experimental medicine, University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, letter from 215
Sanford A. Miller, Ph. D., Chestnut Hill, Mass., letter from 215
James E. Murphy, vice president, Massachusetts State Labor Council AFL–CIO, New Bedford, Mass., telegram from 215
National Parks Association, Washington, D.C., statement of, presented by Anthony Wayne Smith, executive secretary 215
National Wildlife Federation, Washington, D.C., statement of, presented by Thomas L. Kimball, executive director 218
New England Farm and Garden Association, Inc., Boston, Mass., letter from Mrs. Robert H. Cook, corresponding secretary 218
Edward Norman, Chatham, Mass., statement of 219
Town of Provincetown, Mass., letter and enclosure submitted by John C. Snow, chairman of selectmen 223
Allen D. Russell, Plymouth, Mass., letter from 221
Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., letter from 225
Howard W. Sears, town clerk, Osterville, Mass., telegram from 111
R. Minturn Sedgewick, Dedham, Mass., letter from 226
Laurence C. Shaw, Cotuit, Mass., letter from 226
Russell E. Singer, executive vice president, American Automobile Association, telegram from 226
Gerald Silverman, Ph. D., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., statement of 226
J. Sidney Stone, Boston, Mass., letter and statement from 227
John P. Sylvia, Jr., attorney, Falmouth, Mass., telegram from 228
George C. Tenney, New York, N.Y., letter from 227
The Trustees of Reservations, Milton, Mass., resolutions presented by Loring Conant, executive secretary 228
Dorothy F. Mixter, Woods Hole, Mass., letter from 229
Westfield River Watershed Association, Inc., letter from 230
Robert K. Wheeler, Great Barrington, Mass., letter from 230
Harold Durand White, North Eastham, Mass., letter from 230
Mr. and Mrs. E. A. Wilson, Truro, Mass., letter from 231
William D. Adams, Boston, Mass., letter from 232

CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1960

EASTHAM TOWN HALL,
Eastham, Mass.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m. in the Eastham Town Hall, Eastham, Mass., Hon. Gracie Pfost (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mrs. PFOST. The Subcommittee on Public Lands will now come to order. We are happy that Congressman Chenoweth of Colorado has been able to join us this morning. I should like to start out by introducing Judge Chenoweth, Congressman from Colorado, who has just come in from Boston where he attended a hearing yesterday on the Upper Colorado River Basin project in Colorado. Is that true, Judge?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Right.

Mrs. PFOST. To my left, is Congressman Ullman of Oregon, whose home is just across the Snake River from mine, in western Idaho. To his left, is the Congressman from Alaska, Ralph Rivers. [Applause.]

Then, we have with us our very able staff members, whom we could not get along without. One has been in your midst making arrangements which I hope are satisfactory to everyone, Mr. Karl S. Landstrom, the staff consultant on public lands; Mr. T. Richard Witmer, the committee counsel, and our able official reporter, Mr. Karl Veley.

I should like to start out by reading a brief statement. The members of the committee are very happy in spite of the inclement weather for having this opportunity to come here and to view the sites that are involved in the legislation which has been before our subcommittee for at least two or three sessions of Congress.

I should like to explain that all bills died with the end of the 86th Congress and therefore, no doubt, new bills will be introduced in the coming new session—probably on the very first day.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I have come here to the famous and beautiful Cape Cod from my own State of Idaho to open this first session of hearings of the Subcommittee on Public Lands on legislation to establish the Cape Cod National Seashore. As you know, if the proposal is enacted, a considerable area of land on the outer cape will become a unit of the national park system, administered by the Department of the Interior.

In my own case, and the case of two of my colleagues, my arrival here was by way of Williamsburg, Va., where we met earlier this week as members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. Our deliberations at Williamsburg have placed us, I am sure, in a better position to consider the evidence about to be heard concerning the Cape Cod area.

President-elect John F. Kennedy only last week, at the occasion of the announcement of the appointment of Congressman Udall as Interior Secretary, pointed to Cape Cod as one of the last remaining chances to preserve a major recreational area from ultimate destruction.

I am glad to note that Congressman Udall, who is a distinguished member of our committee, has already pledged himself and the department to head toward a great new effort on behalf of recreational resources. I am sure that constructive proposals offered by the new administration will be carefully and promptly considered in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the next Congress.

Congressman Udall has assured me of his personal interest in the Cape Cod proposals, and he has expressed his regrets at not being able to be here today.

The proposals to protect vanishing shorelines of the country do not affect only one section of the country or come from only one of the two great political parties. We have before us proposals dealing with Point Reyes in California, Padre Island in Texas, and various others in addition to Cape Cod. Outstanding among the advocates of the Cape Cod Seashore are Senator Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts and our own distinguished committee colleague, Hon. John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania, who expected to be here, but who yesterday told us that he would be unable to come.

I am sure that I speak for all of the committee members when I acknowledge the fine cooperation that has been given to the committee by the Honorable Hastings Keith, your Congressman from this district, by other members of the Massachusetts delegation, by officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, officials of the county and the towns, the Department of the Interior, and many others.

I may add that Congressman Keith has been very persistent in requesting hearings, particularly field hearings, so that committee members may have the opportunity of actually seeing what is involved. He, of course, told us that summer was the best time and he requested us and invited us to come up last summer, but committee members, because of our heavy schedule in Congress last year, were unable to attend. We felt it would be better to come here even though you have snow on the ground and see what is involved than not to see the area at all.

I would like to welcome, at this time, all who are present and hope that we may become better acquainted and more familiar with the problems that are involved.

As you know, hearings on Cape Cod Seashore legislation were held by committees of both Houses during the 86th Congress, but the legislation was not reported out of committee. These present hearings will bring up to date and supplement the earlier information.

At the previous hearing the distinguished former Attorney General, Francis Biddle, made a point that Cape Codders are great individualists, having about as many different kinds of opinions as one would look for. After looking at our list of some 80 suggested revisions to date, I can well believe Judge Biddle's characterization and in listening to the various people who have already given us their opinions, I can understand what individualists you people truly are.

The committee is well aware of the damage to natural resources and to local interests that might be caused by indecision in this matter. It is my hope that the proposals may be acted upon quickly after Congress reassembles in January.

I think it is accurate to say that the consensus of the communications reaching the committee favors establishing the Seashore, but only after consideration is given to a great many details. It is my hope that these hearings will concentrate on the detailed points at issue. Among these are (1) adjustments in the boundaries to avoid undue hardships; (2) exceptions to the power to condemn land; (3) extent of occupancy and development to be permitted within the boundaries; (4) provision for temporary Federal payments in lieu of taxation; and (5) the kinds of public uses that are to be permitted once the lands are acquired.

I ask that witnesses confine their oral testimony to these specific issues wherever they can.

You are requested to observe the rules of the committee. Taking of photographs or recordings is prohibited during hearing sessions and the audience should make no expression of approval or disapproval.

Witnesses should turn in copies of their proposed testimony at once to the committee staff. Witnesses will be called in the order announced by the chairman. Time for oral summaries is limited to the announced time unless otherwise arranged with the committee, and we would request you please do not read long statements.

We want to hear as many individuals who have a great personal interest in the matter that is before the committee today as is possible. Hence we ask you to summarize your statements if they are lengthy, so that a great deal of time will not be needed for any one individual.

The statement in full may be filed for the record and will be printed if it meets the rules of the committee. At the close of the hearings, the record will be held open for a short time for the receipt of additional statements.

One or two people have suggested to the committee that at some time during these hearings, opportunity should be provided for the audience to show their hands as to their preference in the matter involved. I am familiar with the tradition of the New England town meeting, and the desire of the average citizen to have a vote. But this, of course, would be outside the rules, since voting on pending legislation in a congressional committee is restricted to the committee members.

Unless there are further statements at this time from the committee members, I shall announce the schedule of witnesses at this time, and then call the first witness.

Does any member of the committee wish to make a statement at this time?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I just want to say, Madam Chairman, I am delighted to see my former colleague, Mr. Nicholson, who formerly represented this district in Congress, and with whom I greatly enjoyed my service. I am delighted to see you, Nick.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you, Judge Chenoweth. We expected to recognize Mr. Nicholson a little bit later and I, too, would like to add my words of appreciation at seeing Mr. Nicholson here and we shall give him an opportunity to be heard, if he should like to make a statement, immediately following Congressman Hastings Keith.

Our first witness this morning is Congressman Keith, your own Congressman from this district. As I said earlier, Congressman Keith has been most concerned about this legislation and has been very persistent in making sure that due consideration is given to the problems involved in the measures before the subcommittee.

Mr. Keith?

STATEMENT OF HON. HASTINGS KEITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Keith. Thank you, Mrs. Pfost.

As Congressman from the Ninth Congressional District, I want to express my appreciation and that of my constituents for the interest of the distinguished members of the Public Lands Subcommittee who have come to our district to hear our views on the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore. We welcome you most cordially and know that you will be enriched by your stay on Cape Cod—one of the Nation's most interesting and beautiful areas.

I have appeared before congressional committees on this legislation on three separate occasions. Furthermore, I know that, while I can continue to discuss this proposal with the members of the committee, this is the best opportunity for many of those most intimately involved to air their views. Therefore, I shall make my statement brief.

Upon introduction of this legislation, early in September of 1959, I explained that in dealing with Cape Cod, we are not concerned with the usual, relatively undeveloped national park area. As you have seen, several well-developed and prosperous communities are involved in this proposal. Therefore, any legislation creating a national seashore on the Cape must recognize the unique character of the area and its problems.

H.R. 9050 does this. It is more than a statement of the principle that preserving shoreline areas deserves our support. It embodies a knowledge of the distinct nature of the area, the people, and the character of the Cape.

Following the introduction of the bill, the Department of the Interior sent to the Congress a report which recommended changing or eliminating some of its essential features.

One of the most important of these was expressed in what is known as the 10 percent clause. This provision recognized that, in order to keep the six towns involved self-sufficient and dynamic, it would be necessary to provide additional land for normal expansion and growth. We provided, therefore, that 10 percent of the land taken from each town would be returned to them as needed for growth.

The Department of the Interior has recommended that this provision be stricken. Furthermore, there was some feeling on the part of the sponsors and the towns that the administration of this clause would be cumbersome.

As a result, I contacted the selectmen of the lower Cape towns and explained to them that this provision would probably be left out of the bill. I told them that any land which was needed by the towns for future development would, accordingly, have to be eliminated prior to the enactment of the legislation. I told them that I would support their recommendations for boundary changes so long as they did not interfere with the basic purposes of the seashore proposal. As you know, the boundary revisions were offered by the towns to this committee at the Washington hearings.

The Department of the Interior also recommended that the "payments in lieu of taxes" provision be stricken from the bill. Since these payments are necessary to the economy of the towns, I have urged that this clause remain in the legislation.

Our bill further provides for an advisory commission to help the Federal Government in its policy decisions affecting the park and surrounding towns. This would permit the seashore's administrator and the town governments to exist harmoniously and act in unison. The Department's recommendation that the commission be terminated after 10 years destroys its very purpose—long-range cooperation. I think this commission should be permanent.

I feel very strongly that the original principles written into legislation by our two Massachusetts Senators and myself must not be sacrificed. I am hopeful that the effect of this hearing will be twofold—first that the House committee will agree that the major provisions and purposes of our bill should be enacted into law, and, second, that the committee will work for prompt consideration of the proposal in the coming Congress.

There are two other matters which concern me. There are some who fear that our bill may have overemphasized recreation. I want to make it clear that the major intent of the sponsors was conservation. When it became evident that the word "recreation" in our bill was being interpreted by some as synonymous with destruction, we requested a statement from the National Park Service on how the area would be administered.

They confirmed our longstanding belief that the Park Service would only intend to make recreational activity available within controlled areas—that the major emphasis would be conservation and preservation.

The Department of the Interior also recommended the elimination of a clause in our bill which would allow expedition in acquiring of property from landowners who would want to sell to the Federal Government as soon as possible. I feel very strongly that this clause should be retained.

Finally, just let me say that I know you will receive many constructive suggestions for the improvement of the legislation today and tomorrow. Both the Senators and I emphasized upon introduction of the bill and have restated continuously that our provisions are not inflexible. I am convinced that upon conclusion of these hearings, the legislation can reach a final form which will serve to benefit both the Nation and the Cape. This legislation will, I hope, receive prompt consideration by the new Congress.

I appreciate the time you have given me to outline my views.

And in conclusion, I would like to comment just briefly on a story that was contained in a paper yesterday concerning the extent of the proposed deletions from the bill under consideration with reference to the area to be taken.

We have prepared for the use of the committee, and they have had it during the course of their visit here, a map showing the original boundaries contained in H.R. 9050, and the Senate bill. We have imposed upon that map the areas which the selectmen of the towns involved have, after due consideration, concluded that would be best eliminated from the proposed taking.

It is very easy to see from a survey of this map that the total does not approximate the 25 percent, particularly when you take into consideration that within the areas which they propose to delete from the legislation there are already a great many private dwellings. Take, for example, Bound Brook, which is shown here on the map. It indicates that a great deal of property would be excluded from the proposed park. But actually, under the terms of our bill all property that is currently used for dwelling purposes is excluded anyway and this area is fairly well developed. So, too, are the other areas that are being proposed for deletion from the park. These items are enclaves that appear on this map and are not total deletions; they sort of round out the little villages which they represent so that the private development can take place further within those areas, and it is not nearly as extensive as appears from the map and the map is not nearly as extensive as would be indicated from some of the press reports on the subject.

I want to make this point because the selectmen of the towns have been reasonable in their requests and I think that they are close to the people even as we, as Congressmen, are close to the people. And they are the channels which we should respect and which I have found worthy of our consideration.

Thank you, Madam Chairman, for the opportunity to speak and I hope you have a successful stay here. I know that the legislation that is forthcoming from your committee will be in the best interests of the Cape and our country.

Madam Chairman, I request permission to insert in the record a tentative statement of policy of the National Park Service.

Mrs. PFOST. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE—TENTATIVE STATEMENT OF POLICY, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, MARCH 1960

The basic concept governing the type of use and management of the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore is stated in the act of 1916 which established the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior.

"The Service thus established shall promote and regulate the use of Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations hereinafter specified by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of said parks, monuments, and reservations, *which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein* and *to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.*" [Italic supplied.]

This concept has been translated into a body of basic policies, procedures, and standards that are well established and that govern the work of the Service throughout the Nation. As applied to Cape Cod, these policies and standards call for the following approach to preservation and use.

1. Halt impairment of the natural and historic features.
2. Protect and preserve the natural features and retain the life and atmosphere of the seafaring era and historic Cape Cod.
3. Rehabilitate or restore features already impaired.

4. Keep to a minimum the disruption of the life of each town during and after the transitional period from existing land uses to park uses.

5. Cooperate closely with the adjacent towns in the planning of approaches and adjacent land area to assure that town and park relationship will be harmonious.

6. Provide for the use and enjoyment of the area through properly located facilities, interpretive and other visitor services, as described more fully below.

The protection of the proposed area as a national seashore would provide a continuing source of inspiration and enjoyment to the Nation's people. The fascination of the sea and its seaside environment are intangible values. Be it called sightseeing, mental refreshment, aesthetic appreciation, or enhancing our educational concept of nature's revelations—this source of enjoyment would constitute the major activity.

These inspirational and educational values, together with related resource use possibilities, comprise the recreational potentials. Swimming in the rich surf of the Atlantic or in the more subdued bayside waters, walking the endless beaches, hiking among the dunes, through the forests, and among the lakes, are pleasures that can be widely enjoyed. Opportunities are also excellent for bicycling, camping, photography, sport fishing, sketching, birdwatching, research study of natural history, and hunting of migratory waterfowl in designated areas in accordance with State regulations.

The planning and provision of visitor-use facilities for the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore as provided by S. 2636 would, from necessity, be a carefully considered and long-range program in view of existing uses and the continuation of many of these uses for a long time to come.

Several factors would guide the type, amount and location of uses permitted and those provided for as discussed below.

The problems presented by the annual influx of visitors to Cape Cod are unavoidable, and with visitation increasing, as it surely is, these problems will multiply. The formulation of a comprehensive plan for dealing with this increasing use is essential. A national seashore on the Cape would predicate such a plan—a plan designed to facilitate the orderly use and enjoyment of natural lands and historic features and provide a legal instrument for their protection, yet consider the rights of present property owners, towns, and other developments. This protection would prevent abusive and indiscriminate human uses, as well as protect the area from natural destructive agencies. The ultimate objective of such a plan would be preservation with compatible use and enjoyment of the natural and historic features that are Cape Cod.

It is the policy and practice of the National Park Service to preserve outstanding scenic, scientific, and historic features of high intrinsic value. Nevertheless, it is also committed to provide for the enjoyment of such features within the limits of good taste and decorum. For instance, a small kettle-hole lake of great geologic interest would not be the site of a major use development. However, a modest trail for controlled access and an unobtrusive plaque for interpretation might be desirable. Features of a fragile nature must be protected from undue wear, for example, ground cover composed of species of heather and caribou moss which forms a delightful patterned carpet on open slopes and beneath scattered pine trees. Most of these heathers and lichens are too fragile to withstand the least amount of traffic. The beach grass, so important in holding the sand near the sea and among the dunes, may be able to withstand some abuse, but once it is worn down and uprooted, the sand is free to shift and move at will. On the cliffs, every movement of human feet up or down their slopes wears them back a little farther and wear on the slopes of the fresh-water kettle-hole lakes is even more devastating.

Each of these situations must receive individual attention in the plan for preservation and protection. In most cases, limitation of the type of use would be most important, but, in addition, channeling of use would also be necessary. For instance, a delicate area of heather and lichen would be destroyed if camping, picnicking, or similar uses were permitted. Channeling of foot travel would be necessary in the form of trails from which the public could enjoy the biotic display without physical harm to the area. In the case of dunes, indiscriminate use of beach buggies would soon destroy the vegetation growing on them, causing blowouts and sand movement. The beach proper, however, is not likely to be damaged physically by normal recreation use. However, it would be important, except in areas of intensive public use, to make sure that nesting areas of waterfowl be undisturbed and the peace and solitude preserved. It seems logical that beach buggies could be permitted in designated sections away from other recreation use and from nesting areas, but limited to the beach and specified access points. Where it is not feasible to locate beach access points near sea level, the public should be channeled by topography, vegetation or artificial means to a ramp or series of steps leading to the beach below.

In certain areas, the preservation of historic structures and the evidence of earlier ways of living as associated with the colonial and seafaring eras of Cape Cod would be a prime objective. Preliminary studies made in 1959 by the National Park Service, Historic American Building Survey, located 65 houses that might be considered in this category. More detailed studies will continue this year, with measured drawings made of the most significant houses and specific recording of data on others as well. Often these houses are grouped in such a way that their localities could be designated as historic districts, with plans directed toward perpetuating the historic and landscape values involved. We consider historic preservation an important element in the total park program.

It is the policy of the Service to provide campgrounds when they are essential for the proper use and enjoyment of the parks and when there exists adequate ground space to accommodate them without serious encroachment upon, or damage or threat to, the preservation of important natural, scenic, aesthetic, scientific, and historical values. The Service does not have authority, nor an obligation, to provide for camping as a purely diversionary activity. Camping is permitted only in designated areas and usually with a time limitation of 15 days' camping by any one person or group in a campground, within any 1 year. In the case of the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore such facilities would be equally separated from existing private residential uses. The Service is not obligated to provide camping and picnic facilities for an unlimited demand, but only as it is consistent with space and good conservation practice. It is expected that camping facilities would be limited during the formative years of the park, and that space controls would be initiated to limit the number of campers to number of planned campsites.

Concession developments that would compete with private industry would not be introduced within the park. Private industry outside the park would be relied on to furnish accommodations, lodging and related services.

The rich natural, historical, and scientific heritage of Cape Cod will be of intense interest to future visitors. It is basic policy of the Service to provide interpretation of the basic values of each park to visitors. To enable them more fully to recognize, understand, and appreciate the value of Cape Cod as a part of our American heritage, an active educational program would be developed. This would include one or more visitor centers with museum displays and exhibits, informative publications, campfire programs, conducted nature walks and history walks, and self-guiding trails and tours, including wayside exhibits.

The physiographic distribution of points of interest throughout the long ribbonlike area, offers an excellent opportunity to separate the types of use activities in such a way as to disperse visitor use. The ultimate pattern of traffic within the park should be a simplified, orderly circulation as independent as possible from the existing arterial traffic on Route 6. Safe, orderly traffic flow could be increased materially if Route 6 were redesigned as a limited access highway, with perhaps no more than one or two park access points provided from it within each town. This would require the joint planning of towns, State, and Federal Government.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you, Congressman Keith, for a very constructive statement.

Are there any questions of Congressman Keith? Apparently not.

(Discussion off the record.)

(By later order of the committee, other congressional statements and a statement by Governor-Elect John A. Volpe follow:

STATEMENT OF HON. SILVIO O. CONTE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

It is a pleasure to have been granted an opportunity to express my thoughts on the proposed national seashore park to this committee and to reaffirm my strong convictions in favor of the establishment of this park on Cape Cod. As you know, I have appeared before this committee and the Senate Committee on Insular Affairs on behalf of this project. I believe this indicates my strong convictions about this measure.

Last year I joined with my colleague, Representative Hastings Keith and with Senators Saltonstall and Kennedy in introducing a measure which would establish a national seashore park on the cape. Since that time I have become increasingly aware of the worthiness and necessity of national legislation fullfilling this need and that the proposed plan is the most effective way and practical means of preserving the scenic charm and enhancing the historic way of life that characterizes that area.

The introduction of this legislation was promulgated by overwhelming sentiment throughout the Northeast and Massachusetts to arrest the alarming spread of population and urban development which is seriously threatening to obliterate the natural and unspoiled beauties of this internationally known and loved shoreline. The response to this proposal within my own district has been exceptionally heavy and overwhelmingly favorable. My constituents are genuinely concerned that action should be taken to insure the sensible preservation of our outstanding natural resource—the scenic beauty of Cape Cod—from the careless and uncontrolled expansion of population and commercial overdevelopment.

Today many Americans are increasingly able to spend more and more time away from their occupations in pursuit of recreation, and we, as a nation, have been able to create continually greater opportunity for leasure and relaxation. Nevertheless, we have been slow to develop our publicly owned resources in order that our recreational facilities may accommodate these newly found and enlarged features of our way of life. Nowhere is this more evident than in the northeastern and Atlantic areas of our country which possess a large share of the Nation's urban concentrations. It is no longer merely desirable, but now indeed imperative, that such a worthy proposal not be allowed to become stalemated and extinguished in needless and frivolous controversy. There is so little of our shoreline that today remains in its natural state or reasonably close to such condition that further delay in adopting a plan at least similar to that proposed in the past session of Congress could well mean the disappearance of our undefiled shoreline. Such a loss would be both foolish and tragic.

Of late, I have heard of several areas of criticism voiced of the proposal by interested parties. Much of this criticism, I feel, is based upon the misconception that the private interests of the citizens of those communities to be affected by the proposal are threatened. Well aware that potential impositions on these rights existed, the proposal was so designed as to not only preserve the shoreline heritage for future generations, but to do so without destruction or infringement of the legitimate rights of residents of the cape.

It is inconceivable to me that anyone can seriously oppose this measure, a measure designed, as it was conceived, to protect and preserve the very factors which make the area so precious to the Nation and to current property owners. It will, in fact, enhance those very attributes now erroneously believed to be threatened. The provisions of the legislation were intended to, and, I feel, do, incorporate valid consideration and respect for the various National, State and local interests.

I am confident that as a result of the propositions so carefully written into the letter of the law and the full incorporation into the spirit and letter of the proposal of those intentions of the original authors of the idea, it will be possible to create a great national park in this area—an area which may otherwise be hopelessly blighted by the relentless sweep of population and the malignant advance of commercial overdevelopment.

Sensible action now, while the opportunity remains, will preserve for Americans a priceless heritage to be enjoyed throughout the ages by many generations.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. LANE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, Cape Cod, with its lovely beaches and its picturesque towns, has long been a summer attraction for vacationers and tourists. But the march of the bulldozers, and private exploitation of its quaint beauty, threatens to break up and artificialize a natural resource that is irreplaceable.

Imagine what would have happened to scenic wonders of our national parks in the West if they had not been set aside and protected by the Federal Government for the enjoyment of the touring public. Hotdog stands and honkytonks and get-rich-quick enterprises would have stripped the landscape and filled it with noise and gaudy confusion.

The same fate threatens Cape Cod unless we reserve the 30,000 acres that have been selected as a national seashore on the outer banks of the cape for the permanent enjoyment of the public.

We can understand the attitude of some local interests who may feel that they are called upon to make too great a sacrifice, or who find it difficult to accommodate themselves to this proposal. But I believe that, through explanation, reasonable adjustments, and adequate financial compensation, we can arrive at a meeting of the minds that will provide a happy solution for all concerned.

There is not much time left. And the Cape is one of the few natural seashore areas on the Atlantic coast that have not been overwhelmed by commercialism that assumes no responsibility for conservation, or for the public needs.

For the relatively small sum of $16 million, we can reserve a section of the outer cape as a sanctuary of untarnished beauty in perpetuity for the enjoyment and inspiration of our own people, and visitors from all over the world.

I need not point out the economic benefits to the residents of communities in this area that will flow from the establishment of this seashore as a unit of the national park system. What I do emphasize is the objective of the National Park Service to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

The outer banks of Cape Cod and their unique charm will be overrun by the blight of commercialism unless we protect them as a national seashore under the prudent and loving care of the National Park Service, that will maintain this area unspoiled for the benefit of all.

I am sure that we can reconcile minor differences of opinion in a mutually satisfactory manner to insure the preservation of Cape Cod's natural beauty in the public interest.

MALDEN, MASS., *December 15.*

Congresswoman GRACIE PFOST,
Governor Prence Motor Lodge, Orleans, Mass.:

The proposal for a Cape Cod National Seashore Park is one of great importance, not only to the citizens of Cape Cod, but those of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Nation as a whole would feel an early decision should be made on this proposal which has been under consideration for the past 4 years. A decision in favor of or against the establishment of a park will relieve the anxiety of the local residents. While it is probable that some boundary revisions should be made the most important thing is to decide the question one way or the other and as early as possible in the next session of the Congress.

JOHN A. VOLPE, *Governor-elect.*

(COMMITTEE NOTE.—The following telegram was also received from Hon. Edward P. Boland, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts:)

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *December 16, 1960.*

Hon. GRACIE PFOST,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Land,
U.S. House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Town Hall, Eastham, Mass.:

Regret my inability to be present for these hearings on Cape Cod National Seashore Park legislation. As one of the original sponsors of the bill I am sure those present are aware of my profound interest in this worthwhile proposal to establish a vitally needed recreational area and beauty spot in Massachusetts for the use of the Nation's citizens. The vanishing American seashore line should be the concern of our citizens and their representatives in Congress. As the U.S. population continues to increase there has been no corresponding increase in natural recreation preserves to accommodate our Massachusetts citizenry. The great outer beach of Cape Cod is the last remaining stretch of unspoiled beach along the entire Atlantic coast and is unsurpassed in natural beauty. It offers us one of the finest opportunities available to preserve into perpetuity a magnificent playground for America. Its development will certainly be beneficial for the people and communities of Cape Cod. Congress must act promptly if the great outer beach is to be saved. Not to preserve the outer beach would be a grievous mistake. I sincerely hope that members of your subcommittee will submit a favorable report on this legislation early in the session of Congress.

(Signed) EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Member of Congress.

Mrs. PFOST. At this time, Congressman Nicholson, would you like to make a statement regarding the legislation before us? It is good to see you again and we will be happy to hear from you. You were a very valuable Member of the Congress and it was my pleasure to have worked with you for something above 6 years, I believe.

STATEMENT OF DONALD W. NICHOLSON, FORMER CONGRESSMAN FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. NICHOLSON. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I notice that Congressman Keith was worried about sitting with the Democrats, but I am not afraid because you are well balanced with Judge Chenoweth here.

I did not intend to make any remarks, Madam Chairman, because I already made a statement in Washington and it is on file with the committee, but we were confused people who were interested in the legislation and found that we had 7 or 8 different bills. I do not know if there is any way of stopping it, but I think as long as the department has full jurisdiction over this matter that they are the ones who should draw the bill, that is, if they are going to, and I imagine that they will because you are having hearings on it.

There are a lot of things that never appear in public. Of course, the people as a whole are not interested, unless they happen to live in the area or believe in constitutional government.

I would like to call your attention to the map here and I think it takes part of the province lands in Provincetown. Province lands in Provincetown have been province lands since 1620, ever since Provincetown, the Pilgrims first went there. They set this off. In order for the Federal Government to step in and make a recreational area of it, or a business area, or any other kind of an area, they have got to go to the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, which is the legislature, and get permission to take the land from the State. There is a bill in the legislature now asking the legislature to allow the town of Provincetown to acquire land in the province lands. So the Government has got to look out to see that Massachusetts passes an enabling act to turn this property over to the town of Provincetown and unless they do, well, there is a suit right away because the Government cannot take land that is dedicated for public use.

A lot of people who are in favor of this, Madam Chairman, well, they are in favor of it because of conservation. People said they would not vote for such a thing except for conservation. There is not anything that they can conserve here and there is not any recreation certainly on the outer beaches because you cannot go in swimming there. There is undertow and it is a pretty tough place to go to get recreation when all over Cape Cod you can go to some of the finest beaches in the world. I think we come second to the one up in Oregon, maybe, or something like that. That is just to let Mr. Ullman know we know there are other places for recreation and I imagine there are plenty of them up there.

As I said before, we are going to suffer in Eastham and Wellfleet and Truro because we are going to lose a lot of valuable property that is on the assessor's books. It looks to me as though the tax rate in those particular towns would go up anywhere from $10 to $20 to $30 a thousand. That is not for next year when they are taken, that is forever because the Federal Government is exempt from taxation, and we cannot tax the land.

I do not know what people are thinking of when they want to give up their homes because five or six representatives from western Massachusetts that have probably never been down to Cape Cod put in a bill here to turn it over to them so that they can go in swimming or something.

As I said before, we have got plenty of places for them to do it.

I would like to sit here for another half an hour, but I do not think that I ought to do it because these people are waiting. Of course, I know that you will give real consideration to this matter because it is something that is very unusual, stepping in and taking land that has been settled for over 300 years, and people who have lived here on Cape Cod all their lives and their grandfathers before them on this property, I cannot see giving it up. Of course, they promise to let them stay there their natural life.

Then they put in that we would get reimbursement for taxes and every bill that came out had one of these things taken out of it.

I got a letter that Morris Island down in Chatham probably with proper development will be worth a million dollars in 15 or 20 years, the way people are finding the Cape. But I understand that was in, out, and back in again. So it is difficult to argue on a bill when you do not know exactly what is in it.

I think we ought to go slowly, Madam Chairman, and I would not have any more to say right now unless you give me permission later on.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you very much. Judge Chenoweth has questions to ask you.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to ask if this matter was presented to you while you were a Member of the House?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes; it was presented to me, but I would not file it. There was not any metes and bounds in it originally.

Mr. CHENOWETH. When did this proposal first originate?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Three or four years ago, before I left Congress.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You never introduced any bill while you were there?

Mr. NICHOLSON. No; I would not think of it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Is there substantial opposition to this proposal?

Mr. NICHOLSON. When people understand it, there is. There are a lot of constitutional questions in here. The question of paying for the land. Now, if they cannot agree, the Government takes it by eminent domain. So convenience and necessity come into that, or what is the convenience and necessity of this kind of legislation? It is on the books, eminent domain, of every State in the Union, every city, and every town, but is usually used for roads or something like that.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You mentioned about the possibility of a lawsuit where the State legislature would have to give permission to take certain lands.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Oh, yes. Any property that is dedicated to public use, you know Judge, in all of these probates and everything, those things cannot be touched.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is right.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Like Boston Common, for instance. There is a quarter of a mile or a half a mile of Common that you cannot put a bill in on that or anything like that, and it has been there ever since the Revolutionary days or pretty close to it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Has any consideration ever been given to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts taking over this proposal rather than the Federal Government? You have a State park system in Massachusetts, I understand.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Could this be made a State park? Has any thought ever been given to such a proposal?

Mr. NICHOLSON. There has, but there are houses on these pieces of land. A house here [indicating map] and then the Federal Government comes up here for about an eighth of a mile and then another house.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The Federal Government is not in this picture now, is it?

Mr. NICHOLSON. No.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You would rather they would stay out, as I understand you.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I think it is worth looking into because I do not think the Government can take private property without due process of law. That is what the law says and it is worth looking into. If the committee please, it may be a waste of time to do anything with this until the State of Massachusetts turns this property over to Provincetown and then Provincetown cannot turn it over to the Government unless by a vote of the town.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I assume, then, from what you say, there is a substantial difference of opinion as to the merits of this legislation.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes; indeed there is.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is all; thank you.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Nicholson, what about the other area that excludes Provincetown? Are you against the Federal Government taking any of the seashore in as a national park?

Mr. NICHOLSON. It is a long distance. One is in Texas, I think.

Mrs. PFOST. I mean the balance of the Cape. You do not favor any Federal acquisition of lands and you are against the establishment of a park here? Do I understand you correctly?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Oh, yes; very much opposed to it. Very much.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you. Are there other questions?

Mr. RIVERS. No questions.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you very much, Mr. Nicholson.

Mr. NICHOLSON. We could use some of that land up in Alaska.

Mr. RIVERS. We have plenty to spare.

Mrs. PFOST. Our next witness is Mr. Fred Holborn, assistant to Senator John F. Kennedy. Mr. Holborn will read Senator Kennedy's statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS, AS PRESENTED BY FRED HOLBORN, ASSISTANT TO THE SENATOR

Mr. HOLBORN. I have just a very short statement from the junior Senator, who is at present rather busy translating himself to another assignment. His statement reads as follows:

> Madam Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am sorry that my duties in Washington prevent me from appearing personally before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on behalf of the bill which I have introduced with Senator Saltonstall and Congressman Keith, to establish the Cape Cod National Seashore Park.
>
> I have on many previous occasions expressed my strong support for this legislation and the need to bring this proposal to early realization. I want to assure my constituents in the Commonwealth and on Cape Cod that I shall continue, as President, to press this legislation. The Secretary of Interior-designate, Mr. Stewart Udall, and I share the conviction that the Cape Cod National Seashore Park is worthy of enactment along the lines proposed by Senator Saltonstall and myself in S. 2636 and Congressman Keith, whose counterpart is H.R. 9050. Of course, my administration will be prepared to consider all reasonable amendments and perfections in the legislation. I do, however, believe that we cannot achieve a sound park bill by accepting the lowest common denominator of agreement.
>
> I am delighted that the House committee has decided to give this legislation its concentrated, on-the-spot consideration. I hope that as a result of these hearings and the work already accomplished in the Senate that we can look forward to the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park in 1961.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Mr. Jonathan Moore, assistant to Senator Leverett Saltonstall, who will read the Senator's statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS, AS DELIVERED BY JONATHAN MOORE, ASSISTANT TO THE SENATOR

Mr. MOORE. Madam Chairman and members of the committee: my name is Jonathan Moore. I reside in Orleans on the cape. I am legislative assistant to Senator Saltonstall. The Senator wanted me to convey his welcome to you all and his apologies for not being able to come here personally to appear before you. I have a brief statement of his which I would like to read for the committee.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you, you may proceed.

Mr. MOORE (reading):

> I am grateful to the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for coming to Massachusetts to study at first-hand the questions of establishing a Cape Cod National Seashore Park.
>
> I hope that the testimony given here will offer in a constructive manner new material about the proposal originally sponsored by Senator Kennedy and Congressman Keith and myself. Information gathered at these hearings—added to data acquired by earlier Senate hearings held here a year ago and the hearings held by both committees in Washington last June—should enable the Congress to take final action on the establishment of a park during the first session of the 87th Congress.

I have repeatedly made it clear that I believe a Cape Cod National Seashore Park is critically important and that such a park could be set up in a manner which would protect the interests of the towns and individual citizens directly affected. Our bill was prepared with this purpose in mind, and its sponsors believed it provided a valid basis for study and, in the absence of specific alternatives offering practical and desirable revisions which could be agreed upon, a strong basis for action. Well over a year has passed since the bill was filed in September of 1959, and this period has already been marked by destruction of the area intended to be preserved and a continuation of wasteful confusion and indecision about the nature of the area's economic future.

The original bill filed represented our best effort on a challenging and difficult problem. This legislative proposal was never intended to be final and indeed its sponsors have repeatedly encouraged specific and practical revisions. It is essential—and particularly at the present stage—that suggested revisions to the proposed legislation be consistent with one another and with the basic purposes of the park, and be advanced with sound reasons for adoption. Any resolution of the problem of how best to conserve one of America's few most magnificent stretches of natural seashore and at the same time provide for a healthy future for the towns and their inhabitants is a delicately balanced one. It must be reached expediently, logically, and without inner contradictions.

With regard to the need for early action on the cape park proposal and the help which these hearings can give, I would like to quote the following two paragraphs from an "Open Letter to the Citizens of Cape Cod" which Senator Kennedy and myself wrote at the end of September:

"We emphasize again that the legislative process calls for an agreement on specifics rather than more reiteration of vague and polemical generalities. In our judgment, S. 2636 strikes a unique balance in the preservation of the seashore area and the protection of interests of individual homeowners. The response which we had at the time of the bill's introduction—and since—confirms this belief. By comparison with traditional national park legislation, the bill provides unprecedented protection to the six lower cape towns. In addition, we feel that the provisions of the bill and the record of the Park Service give promise that preservation of the area would not be frustrated by excessive and indiscriminate recreational uses. We have repeated many times our pledge to include in new legislation a provision for payment in lieu of taxes to the towns.

"During the past year, we have noted a continued increase in population density and commercial expansion in the lower cape. Delay and indecision have brought waste and have imperiled further the proper preservation of this incomparable segment of America's natural and historical heritage. More building permits have been issued, more bulldozers slash at oak trees and scrub pine, more property developments clutter land adjacent to the great beaches, more subdivisions are approved. This relatively open and magnificent stretch of nature could quickly be reduced to an unplanned conglomeration of developments spoiling the broad sweep of dune, the clean sand beach, the open stretches of marshlands, the cedar forests, and meadow. All of these facts make action urgent."

I thank the subcommittee for letting me make this statement, and again I thank its members and staff for their personal interest and work on this important project.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you very much, Mr. Moore.

Our next witness is Mr. Charles H. W. Foster, commissioner of natural resources, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES H. W. FOSTER, COMMISSIONER OF NATURAL RESOURCES, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. Foster. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, I am Charles H. W. Foster, commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Natural Resources, representing today both the department and its board of natural resources, Thomas A. Fulham, chairman. May I place both these agencies on record as favoring the full and speedy implementation of legislation which would authorize a national park on Cape Cod?

I have also been asked to represent His Excellency Foster Furcolo, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and if I may, I will read a statement on his behalf [reads]:

> During the past 4 years, I have endeavored to increase opportunities for outdoor recreation in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by supporting programs for the expansion of State parks and beaches and by urging the creation of a National Seashore Park on Cape Cod. This great sweep of Atlantic Beach from Provincetown to Chatham and its adjoining uplands constitutes one of the greatest outdoor natural assets and would be of inestimable value to our citizens, as well as to the Nation, if preserved under public ownership.
>
> The Massachusetts General Court has memorialized Congress on behalf of such a national park. Members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation have sought its creation. Citizens from every walk of life and sections of the Commonwealth, and a great majority of our news media have urged that this marvelous natural resource be set aside for posterity.
>
> I, therefore, take this opportunity to again ask that the Cape Cod National Seashore Park be established without further delay and that your committee take prompt and favorable action to implement such proposals during the coming year.

Signed "Foster Furcolo, Governor, Commonwealth of Massachusetts."

I have also received some five communications addressed to your subcommittee that I would like to offer for the record, without reading them.

Mrs. Pfost. Is there objection to the instruments being placed in the record? Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

(Documents referred to appear in the appendix.)

Mr. Foster. In the remainder of my testimony today, Madam Chairman, I am going to cut down my full statement at your request as long as it may be included in full in the record.

Mrs. Pfost. It will be included in full in the record, Mr. Foster.

Mr. Chenoweth. May I make an inquiry, Madam Chairman? I think Mr. Foster is one of the most important witnesses we will have. I would like to have his full statement read. He represents the Department of Natural Resources. It is an interesting statement and I think we should go into a little detail.

Mrs. Pfost. Then you may proceed as you desire, Mr. Foster.

Mr. Foster. Thank you.

At previous congressional hearings, I have attempted to explain in some detail our support for a Cape Cod National Seashore Park. May I summarize in a few sentences the substance of this prior testimony?

The area in question, although situated in Massachusetts, contains scenic, historical, cultural, and recreational values of national stature. The Commonwealth and its member communities have exercised a traditional concern for such values over the years, but the job now at hand on the lower Cape, by virtue of its high cost and extreme urgency, far exceeds the present capacity of these lesser governmental agencies.

Furthermore, the proposed park represents, in our opinion, a bargain opportunity for the Federal Government in terms of the type of area proposed for preservation, its location within easy reach of one-third of the Nation's population, and its adaptability to reasonable and proper forms of public usage.

Finally, I would like to mention again the consistent official endorsement of this park proposal by the Governor and Legislature of Massachusetts, the widespread support expressed editorially by virtually every newspaper in the State, and the countless organizations, agencies, and private citizens, many within the park itself, who have raised their voices in favor of such a project.

The remainder of my testimony today will concern itself with one feature of the park proposal which now apparently constitutes a major cause for concern. Your committee will undoubtedly hear much today about this matter. I refer to the alleged conflict between recreation and conservation once the park comes officially into being.

It has been expressed to me by native Cape Codders whom I otherwise respect that the park would be satisfactory to them if it merely protected and preserved. But they envision under Federal jurisdiction a sea of waste paper, sprawling tent colonies, a forest of hot dog and souvenir concessions, and an endless procession of human feet trampling what once used to be the wilderness of Cape Cod. While the concern is understandable, there is much that can be said in reply.

In the first place, the National Park Service must find this criticism somewhat unique. No agency has defended more strongly the inviolate nature of lands and waters under its control. In fact, the Service has been criticized frequently for its overemphasis upon the so-called wilderness aspects to the exclusion of the multiple uses of its resources. I can think of no Federal agency that would tend to be more sympathetic to pure conservation than the National Park Service.

There also seems to be a general misunderstanding as to the role of public-use facilities in a park, and I would like to draw on our own experience at the State level to correct what seems to be a faulty impression. While I cannot speak for the National Park Service, I should point out that the Massachusetts State park system, similar to many others throughout the country, owes its beginnings to the Civilian Conservation Corps camps operated by the Service and, consequently, draws heavily upon this agency for its basic planning principles.

In Massachusetts, we are fortunate in having 45 recreation areas located within some 170,000 acres of park and forest land. Based on statistics just recently compiled, the area used actively by the public in no instance constitutes more than 10 percent of the total area available in any given forest or park. There are several excellent reasons for such a policy.

In the first place, a park is established in a given location because there are certain natural attractions present. It is inconceivable that any conscientious administrator would permit commercial uses to subordinate a park's very reason for being.

Secondly, conditions of terrain make it unlikely that many portions of a given area are adaptable to public use. A good campground, for example, requires access roads, water and sanitary facilities, single entrance control, and a careful spacing of individual sites or shelters.

Contrary to general belief, laying out a camping area requires skilled services as well as a capital investment ranging between $1,000 and $1,500 per campsite. Just from the physical features of the proposed national park, I would question whether it would be possible to saturate the area with overnight visitors in the fashion feared by the opponents.

Lastly, the bulk of any park, whether State or National, always serves principally as a buffer. That is to say, people using the park are protected from one another, and from those outside the park, by the sizable stretches of undeveloped natural terrain that are an integral part of any sound set of park planning principles.

Nickerson State Park in Brewster, for example, is classified as one of the 100 best public campgrounds in the Nation. A casual visitor would find it hard to believe that 2,000 overnight visitors are present each day during the summer months, because the public-use facilities are carefully insulated by contiguous blocks of undeveloped woods and water.

In my opinion, the factors most likely to bring about overuse of any national park by the public would be sharply reduced boundaries proposed by the opponents.

I would like also to put to rest the common notion that public campers, by virtue of their background, are a menace to a local community. Such could not be further from the truth, and I cite comments collected this summer at Nickerson State Park here on Cape Cod as part of the national study of visitor uses conducted by the Outdoor Recreation Review Commission. I am sure these answers will cast some light on the kinds of people who can be expected to use any public recreation facilities provided by the proposed national park.

Out of 329 questionnaires received, approximately 92 percent were from groups camping as a family. Eighty-seven percent planned to stay at least a week exclusive of travel time. Slightly over half were from out of State. From these first figures, campers would appear little different than any other vacationer on Cape Cod.

They chose swimming, camping, sightseeing, fishing, boating, and relaxing in that order of importance—no different than any other vacationer on Cape Cod. Campers expressed a substantial interest in nature trails, guided tours, and ranger talks; activities which are not presently available in the Massachusetts State parks system, but which would presumably be included in the public programs of any national park.

I should point out that there are no elaborate concessions at this State park, nor did there appear to be any noticeable demand for them. In short, the visitors were campers by preference who required and expected only modest facilities.

By educational background, 95 percent of those completing questionnaires had received the equivalent of a high-school degree, and approximately half listed 5 years or more of college experience. Relative to income levels, nearly one out of three families reported an income of over $10,000 a year, and there were as many incomes in excess of $14,000 as there were under $5,000.

Several unmistakable conclusions can certainly be drawn from these statistics. First, people camp because they want to, not because they have to. Second, contrary to the prevalent image, the public camper on Cape Cod would appear to be an excellent risk for any community.

Although the questionnaire itself bore no direct relation to the proposed national park, many unsolicited comments were received on the subject from the campers surveyed. A copy of these remarks is appended to my statement for the record.

One final comment I would like to make, and that is this. You will undoubtedly hear much about the consequences to be suffered by the six lower cape towns if a national park is established in their midst. There will be predictions of a vastly increased visitor usage and there will be recurring questions as to where the people can be accommodated and how the region's facilities can be made adequate to meet the expected demand.

The national park will undoubtedly be blamed for most of these problems, although in actuality they are only symptomatic of Cape Cod's geographic position relative to the urban sectors of the United States.

May I remind the committee again that the location of this hearing is within a day's drive of 50 million people—people who, park or no park, are already seeking this last stretch of unspoiled shoreline in unprecedented numbers. In the fact of this type of pressure, it would appear far more promising to fix a sense of responsibility and direction for the future, rather than a measure of blame for the past.

May I, therefore, urge prompt action by your committee in the next Congress toward the establishment of an effective and equitable national seashore park on Cape Cod?

(The comments referred to follow:)

UNSOLICITED COMMENTS RECEIVED RELATIVE TO THE CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK, VISITOR USE STUDY, NICKERSON STATE PARK, BREWSTER, MASS., AUGUST 6–SEPTEMBER 5, 1960

(1) We like Nickerson—though actually we find New York, Vermont, and New Hampshire have better facilities * * * Nauset Beach is our biggest attraction in Cape Cod activities.

(2) If this commission has any voice in obtaining part of Nauset Beach as a national park for future generations, we, as a family, strongly urge that this be done.

(3) Our family is greatly interested in the development of the Cape Cod National Seashore. There is no area in the United States that offers more for varied types of recreation than Cape Cod. It is our hope that some of the beauty of the Cape and seashore can be preserved and not become overdeveloped as certain resort areas through the country.

(4) My belief is that in order to take care of the exploding population, it will be necessary for the Federal Government to set up many, many more parks and reserved areas (seashore, mountains, and deserts). Otherwise a couple of generations from now the existing facilities will nowhere near take care of the population. One major step that must be taken is the OK for the Cape Cod Seashore Park—many more miles of seashore must be preserved.

(5) City, State, and Federal Governments should put more of their money into this type of recreational facilities.

(6) Camping is an ideal family recreation and its expansion should be encouraged in the interest of national health, safety, and security. Strong, healthy, and loyal family units make for a strong and healthy Nation. Outdoor recreation in family groups is a deterrent to juvenile delinquency and crime. Public funds expended for the purpose is a sound investment in our country's well-being.

(7) The State and National parks have played a major role in the wonderful vacation we have had this summer. We visited several parks including Acadia National, Chenango, Taghannick, Buttermilk, and so forth, while touring for 3 weeks. We visited Nickerson State Park for 2 weeks. One of the highlights of our trip was the naturalist talks at Acadia. It would be a wonderful thing if such an idea could be incorporated into the program of the State parks. These nature trips were not only educational but most enjoyable.

(8) More areas, especially in the East, should be set apart as wildlife and recreational areas to meet the growing demands for vacation spots and conservation needs, before all good locations are taken by commercial users.

(9) Ideal camping sites, but should have national parks in Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

(10) Nickerson is an excellent campsite area. The need is for many more facilities of a similar nature throughout the State and United States. More people, more leisure, more interest in outdoor living mean rapid expansion of recreational areas is urgently needed. It should be possible to come to a place like this without a 6-month advance reservation.

(11) Camping has become so popular with the American people that we need more camping space, especially in the East.

(12) The number of people using public beaches is growing rapidly and the amount of beach area available is being rapidly reduced. It is essential for State and Federal Governments to increase park areas, beaches, and other facilities for public use.

Mr. FOSTER. May I add also one other comment on statements of a previous witness, relative to the possibility of State action within the area in question?

First, may I say that any Federal action in this regard, to the best of my knowledge, would require concurrence from the State; and, certainly from the testimony that I have delivered at the present time, the thinking of our State government would be to favor that type of action.

Secondly, in terms of the ability of any State to undertake a project of this magnitude, I think you can see some of the problems that would be involved. Of our entire State park system, there is no area that would come anywhere near equaling the size of this proposed seashore park.

Furthermore, the dollar expenditure required to put it into being, I think, would be well out of reach of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts at the present.

So we look forward to a partnership undertaking. There may be places where we could help and certainly through the facilities of my department that offer would be available to the Federal Government. But it seems, ideally, a situation where there should be a partnership between the Federal and the State Governments in this regard.

Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you, Mr. Foster.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon for any questions he wishes to ask.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Foster, I would just ask—you indicated concurrence by the State legislature would probably be necessary. Could you elaborate on that very, very briefly?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the question arose of the constitutionality of a measure of this sort. And, if there were a question of the State's jurisdiction in this regard, I do not think there would be any question at the present time that the State would welcome Federal action of this nature.

And, if it would simplify any constitutional question to have enabling legislation enacted, I cannot speak for our State legislature, obviously, but certainly from the evidence presented thus far there is an interest in doing our part in the establishment of a national park.

Mr. ULLMAN. Has your department made any study of the need for such legislation?

Mr. FOSTER. In terms of enabling legislation?

Mr. ULLMAN. Yes; on the part of the State.

Mr. FOSTER. No detailed study, but it is our impression that enabling legislation on the State's part would be most desirable in this instance and possibly might be essential to the park. This hasn't been explored fully. We would certainly attempt to do so, if the proposal moves along in Congress.

Mr. ULLMAN. This is rather an unusual circumstance.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I recognize that.

Mr. ULLMAN. We do not find it in the case of most park proposals. I would certainly think that as we proceed, if this is true, then we should be working very closely with those in the legislative branch in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in order to get some concurrence in any action that we might take.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. ULLMAN. That is all, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. PFOST. The gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Foster, I want to express my great pleasure for the opportunity to get better acquainted with you. I greatly enjoyed the ride with you from Boston this morning.

Mr. FOSTER. It was our pleasure, Congressman.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You gave me such a fine briefing on this project I feel pretty familiar with it already, even before we have heard the witnesses.

I do want to ask you a few questions concerning some of the matters contained in your very well prepared statement to the subcommittee.

First, you mention the phrase "extreme urgency." I wish you would tell the committee about the urgency for this proposal at this time.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the urgency is on two scores. One, the rapidity with which the ocean shoreline, ocean beach is vanishing from the north Atlantic portion of our coastline. This is particularly true in Massachusetts, an urbanized, densely populated State with growing recreation needs and a shortage of places where the public in the present and in the immediate future are going to be able to receive the benefits of outdoor recreation.

I think the other urgency——

Mr. CHENOWETH. May I interrupt right there?

Mr. FOSTER. Excuse me.

Mr. CHENOWETH. By virtue of the Federal Government coming into this picture, how is that going to change the coastline situation?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it would be a major portion of our shoreline which would be preserved for public use for public benefit in the future.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Could you not do that under your State park system?

Mr. FOSTER. We could, but the cost involved in this particular project would be inordinately high as far as our present ability to pay for.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think the suggested price is something like $15 million.

Mr. FOSTER. I believe that is so.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You would not consider this an impossible project for the State of Massachusetts, would you?

Mr. FOSTER. I would consider it rather unlikely.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You told me this morning something about your park system and the value of the tourist business here, and I have got some figures in mind much larger than that. I would think the $15 million would be a very reasonable sum for you to spend for such purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. May I point out that the State is attempting to expand its own system of State parks and reservations, has a 20-year program on the books, which in the first few years it was anticipated to cost in the neighborhood of $15 million.

In the past 3 years, we have been able to appropriate merely $3 million to start this State expansion program. So there are problems on financing it within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You say it is a bargain opportunity for the Federal Government. We are all looking for bargains these days. You mentioned something about a partnership arrangement. It is my observation, Mr. Foster, if you entered into a partnership with the Federal Government, the State of Massachusetts is going to be the silent partner from then on. The Federal Government will determine policies and will exercise full control over that area. Would you not rather do that yourself here in Massachusetts?

I have been very much impressed with what you told me this morning about the work you are doing and your State park system. I see you are doing a great job.

Mr. FOSTER. Thank you very much.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am just wondering why you do not include this area and do it all as a State project.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is because of the magnitude of the job. As far as being a silent partner, we have worked very closely with the Federal Government through its various resource agencies and I think with great credit to them, they make every effort to bring the State in wherever they can.

In this instance, where we are operating the State park system, in a small State, I cannot help but feel we would have to work very closely with the Federal Government in any project of this sort.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You mentioned there is already some conflict between the recreation groups and the conservation groups over the project.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. What is the nature of that conflict?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is the feeling that by inviting a substantial number of people into the area, that there is a danger of eliminating one of the reasons for bringing the park into being. I just tried to point out in my statement that these two need not be incompatible if the area is under a single administration, a very careful jurisdiction, that these two uses can definitely live comfortably with one another.

I tried to illustrate that with our experience at the State park level.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I was very much interested in the analysis you made of the tourists and campers who come and their financial status and their economic welfare. You do not give a literacy test to these people when they come in, do you?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You mention those with college degrees. How do you get that information?

Mr. FOSTER. This was a questionnaire being distributed to various statistically selected State parks throughout the country as part of the Federal study of our outdoor recreation.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Was there some apprehension if you go into a national park project you are going to bring in a less desirable group?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I believe that thought has been expressed.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You do not concur in that?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not and we were frankly surprised by some of the results revealed by this questionnaire.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You say you now have 45 recreation areas with 170,000 acres of park and forest lands. How many acres would be involved in the seashore park, the Federal project?

Mr. FOSTER. At the present time. we have one State park, Pilgrim Spring State Park, of approximately a thousand acres and it is the feeling of my board of natural resources, the policy board of the department, that once the national park came into being, this property would be turned over to the Federal Government to be administered as part of the entire outer beach section.

Mr. CHENOWETH. How many acres would be in the entire seashore park?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe the figure has been in the vicinity of 30,000 acres.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You now have 170,000 in the State parks and forests?

Mr. FOSTER. The bulk of it is in the western part of our State.

Mr. CHENOWETH. On the Cape, I think you showed me just one.

Mr. FOSTER. Just one area, Nickerson State Park of about 1,700 acres. One is just at the Cape Cod Canal, the Shoreham State Forest. Those are the only ownerships, with the exception of Pilgrim Spring, that my department has jurisdiction over.

The Commonwealth also has, I might add, about 3,000 acres of land at Provincetown, the so-called Province Lands, which are under the jurisdiction of another agency of the State.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am still not quite sure in my mind about the benefits and advantages of the Federal Government coming into this picture, except from the financial part, putting up the money to purchase the land. If the State could do that, you are just as well or better off for the State to exercise control and jurisdiction over this area.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot speak for the Federal Government on this; I am a State official.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Suppose you had the $15 million in the treasury right now, ready to buy the land, would you be better off for the State to go ahead, or would you still want the Federal Government to come in?

Mr. FOSTER. It is my opinion that this is a project of such magnitude as to be a Federal project.

In terms of the size of operations and in terms of the kind of values that are present, it is an outstanding area in this instance. I do not wish to run down my own agency, but I think it probably would be better operated and administered as a National project than a State project.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am afraid you are too modest, Mr. Foster. I think that is all, Madam Chairman, at the moment.

Thank you very much, Mr. Foster.

Mrs. PFOST. The gentleman from Alaska, Mr. Rivers?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Foster, you spoke of the consequence to the towns on the lower peninsula starting at the bottom of page 4 of your statement, and in reporting adverse consequences, you said that—

> there will be predictions of a vastly increased visitor usage and there will be recurring questions as to where people can be accommodated and how the region's facilities can be made adequate to meet the expected demand.

Do you not think if these predictions are correct, that there be an increased visitor usage and there will be a question as to how these people can be accommodated?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; but the point I was trying to make is that these factors are happening right now without a park.

Mr. RIVERS. I see.

Mr. FOSTER. And they are a function of the geographic location of Cape Cod within the growing urban strip from Maine to Virginia, and that these are problems, park or no park, that Cape Cod would have to face. That is my point on that.

Mr. RIVERS. I see. The reason I bring this up is that the towns have asked for some exclusions from the proposed boundary or from the boundaries that have been proposed. I think Provincetown, which I saw and visited in this connection yesterday, is pretty heavily settled and I believe would need some of that exclusion for extra motel accommodations for overnight visitors to Provincetown.

Of course, as I understand it, the Province lands are in the hands of the State now and Provincetown is probably negotiating with the State government at the present time; is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. RIVERS. And that the State in its negotiations with Provincetown will probably decide that question.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. And that this committee probably does not have to worry too much about that particular phase of this program.

Do you not think, though, in connection with some of these other towns that there is room to give and take as far as these proposed exclusions are concerned? I am concerned about the fact that these towns may need some extra acreage there in anticipation of the growth of the future.

Mr. FOSTER. I haven't attempted to get into boundary questions at all. It seems to me this is a subject which should be resolved between the people who are going to administer a national park and the communities who are going to be involved physically in the park.

Mr. RIVERS. Would you like to see them have a meeting of minds that each side could live with and while not entirely good, possibly acceptable on each side?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to see that, but there is a danger of coming up with a compromise, that is not good for the park and perhaps not good for the town.

It seems to me if there is to be a national park, it should be a good one, certainly with the investment that will be required by the Federal Government. So I would caution the committee, just in my opinion, on drastic boundary revisions which would effectively handicap any really good national park on Cape Cod.

Mr. RIVERS. Thank you.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you very much, Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER. Thank you.

Mrs. PFOST. Are there further questions? If not, our next witness is Mr. McNeece, of Chatham, and will Mr. Horton of Truro, Mr. Murray of Orleans, Mr. Hurd of Eastham, Mr. Frazier of Wellfleet, and Mr. Snow of Provincetown, please come forward and join Mr. McNeece at the witness table?

Is Mr. Snow in the audience? I understand he is not here. You may proceed, Mr. McNeece. The committee will hear the statements of each of the selectmen and then we will question you en bloc.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT A. McNEECE, SELECTMAN, TOWN OF CHATHAM, MASS.

Mr. McNEECE. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, Hon. Hastings Keith, and members of the staff, it is my pleasure on behalf of the town of Chatham to welcome you all to Cape Cod, and to thank you very much for making this trip down here under most unfortunate circumstances, so that you could see the area in question and listen to our problems.

Many of us have been so intimately tied up with the details of the proposed legislation that perhaps we have not reviewed it in its proper perspective. Down here, we do realize that the Nation has a responsibility to preserve for future generations areas of historic, scenic, and recreational value.

We realize on Cape Cod, we have a similar responsibility. We agree that areas of such significance on the cape should be preserved for posterity. We, in our individual towns, have, as a matter of fact, made it a policy to do our best in that respect. As far as this particular proposal is concerned, as I said, I did a little reviewing. We had a proposal that was made by the National Park Service early last year when it became public, which resulted from a study and a very comprehensive one, of the Cape Cod area as potential locale for a national seashore.

The National Park Service issued this beautiful brochure and it stated that the justification for the preservation of certain areas of the Cape Cod was that the area was of national significance, scenic, scientific, or historic stature so great and so precious as to make its preservation the concern of all Americans. Now, this is the criteria for areas to be included within the national park system.

As a result of that proposal, Senators Kennedy and Saltonstall, and our own Congressman Hastings Keith introduced legislation for the establishment of such a Cape Cod National Seashore, but each of them imposed certain tests that the seashore must meet before, in their opinion, it would be justified. So I would like to quote from the Congressional Record of Thursday, September 3, of the 86th Congress quoting Senator Kennedy when he introduced this bill:

> Each of us has felt that a national park on Cape Cod was justified only on a strong showing that this was the most effective means of maintaining the historic way of life and scenic beauty of the cape.

Later he said:

> Cape Cod is more heavily settled, enjoys more compact town government, and has a greater degree of development than most previous park areas. It lacks none of the natural beauty and scenic splendor which characterizes most of the national parks, but it is not an unsettled wilderness or forest area. Particularly since there are residents whose roots on the cape reach back far into the past, it seems important to adopt a bill in such a way as to meet the legitimate interests and sentiments of the existing residents. In a bill of this sort, in which we are trying to achieve a new method of park establishment and operation, in which we are entering some uncharted areas of park legislation, it seems to us particularly necessary to have local hearings and to attempt to draw upon the concrete evidence of the local officials and citizens.

In conclusion, he said:

> If we act sensibly now while the opportunity remains, we shall now preserve for America and for our people a priceless heritage to be enjoyed many times over not only for this generation, but by those which will follow.

Senator Leverett Saltonstall also imposed certain tests which, in his opinion, this proposal must meet. He says:

> The author of this bill knows from long personal experience, as well as many years of official responsibility that lower Cape Cod cannot be considered solely as a geographical area with certain physical characteristics. The lower cape must also be viewed as a way of life, a culture which, though conditioned by its environment, finds its essence in the people who have lived and are living there. This bill seeks to preserve the way of life which these people have established.

And finally, our own Hon. Hastings Keith, in summing it all up stated: "A national seashore park should be such"—these are not exact quotations, but substantially exact—

> A national seashore park should be such that the park and the individuality of the cape can exist together and serve each other with mutual benefit.

Now, we have a proposal by the National Park Service to establish a national park which in their opinion undoubtedly would represent the ideal national park. It is only natural that in making a study for the establishment of a national park, that the student would not have all of the information available to him that officials of a particular town do have.

The officials of the particular towns know how much revenue they must have each year, they know the economy on which their towns are based, they know that a certain percentage of the citizens of the towns depend for their living on the building trades. They know that within X number of years, they are going to have to spend X million dollars for additional schools. In other words, they are in a better position just as you ladies and gentlemen of the congressional committee, you are in a better position to interpret the needs of your districts as are the selectmen to interpret the needs of their districts. Therefore, in making this study and in making this proposal for the national park, it is quite natural that all of the complications, all of the special factors could not be known by those who framed the proposal and therefore, it is imposed by Senators Kennedy and Saltonstall and Representative Keith that certain tests be established.

Now, on the lower cape here, after examining their proposal, most of us have determined that if a national park were established according to its original boundaries, it would indeed seriously interfere with or affect the legitimate interests of the towns involved.

Of course, it is my task to speak for the town of Chatham. We have submitted a brief which I hope the committee will give due consideration to. That brief has within it many illustrations which are very pertinent to the position that the town of Chatham takes. The town of Chatham believes that the inclusion of areas of Nauset Beach is a very logical part of a national seashore proposal. It does not entirely meet the tests imposed by the legislators, but the town is disposed to agree to its inclusion in the national park proposal because it is an extension of the great outer beach.

On the other hand, the national park proposal suggests the inclusion and the bill includes an area known as Morris Island and an area known as Monomoy Island. Monomoy Island is indeed an island. It historically, over the centuries, has been an island. It is inaccessible by land. It is now preserved by the National Government under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Limited recreational facilities are provided. In other words, there would be nothing gained as far as the National Park Service is concerned, except that it would be transferring from one agency to another, in which case there is some question as to whether or not the wildlife use of Monomoy would not become subordinated to the recreational use.

The only effect that Monomoy really could have in the inclusion within the boundaries of this park would be to draw a great many people to Chatham in anticipation of seeing Morris Island and yet being unable to get there.

The other area proposed to be included as far as Chatham is concerned is Morris Island. This you had an opportunity to visit yesterday, under not very favorable conditions. But it is a very small area. It is attached to the mainland by a causeway built by the town with State help. And incidentally, its development was started before this national park proposal became public knowledge. If it is developed in the fine manner—one of the most beautiful subdivisions I have ever seen, minimum lot acreage of an acre on one part of it, and about three-quarters of an acre on the other part of it—if it is developed privately in the manner that is contemplated, it would provide the town of Chatham a revenue in taxation of about $50,000 a year which is quite sizable for a town the size of Chatham.

Also in reference to Morris Island, the owners of the property have agreed through our conservation commission to preserve in perpetuity the white cedar bogs which, according to the national park study, was one of the most significant features of Morris Island. As I remember, they mentioned that specifically, also the forest cover and the unusual wildlife. There is no wildlife on Morris Island which is not also found on the mainland. The white cedar bogs do have certain inate characteristics, but the owners of the island, as I have said, have agreed to preserve that as a bird sanctuary in perpetuity, for public use.

The owners have also agreed through our conservation commission to preserve certain marsh areas on the perimeter of the island itself. So that, as a matter of fact, if the island is developed, the general character of the island will be as fine as you can find anywhere on the cape; it will produce a revenue to the town which, according to Senator Kennedy, will be meeting the legitimate interests of the citizens of the cape.

Now, in general, relating this national park proposal to the town of Chatham, in order to get to Morris Island or to Monomoy Island from the center of the park, which is proposed to be in Eastham, you will have to travel 14 miles over that narrow road which you followed yesterday to get to this particular area. In traveling that 14 miles, you will have to go through the finest residential areas of Chatham. What we followed yesterday by the road were some of the finest residential areas of Chatham.

It is common elementary planning knowledge that increased traffic through residential areas is bound to depreciate the residences of that particular area. So that the net result of the inclusion of Morris Island would be that the National Government would be preserving for posterity the relatively small area of woodland and endangering, in our opinion, the fine scenic, historic, relatively unspoiled town of Chatham itself.

In Chatham we are conscious of the dangers that beset us and this being the time when we are reaching the spirit of peace on earth to men of good will, Christmastime, I do sincerely want to say to the national park representatives that I know they have done a sincere and dedicated job. I know that we are very grateful to them for alerting us to the needs to preserve and protect what we have on the lower part of the cape. But as far as Chatham is concerned, they relate in their national park proposal, as a matter of fact, they emphasize the point substantially—"the national park itself will be surrounded by historic charm"—and in their brochure they illustrate the doorway to the old Atwood House in Chatham and yet, if this park is established, and we have the great number of people which it is anticipated will visit the park, there will be a tremendous amount of traffic by this very doorway which will have a tendency to depreciate this particular residential area.

Now, we feel in Chatham that through our own efforts and through our past history of having preserved miles of some of the best beaches available on Cape Cod for public use, having preserved over 500 acres of shore area for public use, having established a conservation commission, protected by laws, that we have done our part in this particular field of preserving for posterity the scenic and historic areas of Cape Cod.

Now, in a very beautiful brochure that was issued by the National Park Service, entitled "That the Past Shall Live," Dr. Conrad Wirth stated:

> The preservation of American historical sites and buildings is not a task which can be accomplished by the Federal Government alone. It must be a cooperative local, State, and National effort. Government agencies on all levels, private preservation organizations and individual citizens all must do their part.

Now, that is Dr. Wirth speaking. He will be here this afternoon, I understand. Chatham believes that through its own history of preservation of colonial homes, churches, windmills, monuments and parks, its preservation for public use of about 500 acres of beach and shore areas, and its vigorous programs to conserve open space and marsh areas, it is doing its part at the local level to cooperate with the program of the National Park Service.

We are located on the elbow of Cape Cod, comparatively remote from the main Cape arteries. Chatham believes that it can achieve its own preservation and implement the overall purpose of the national park legislation itself, if no national attraction is established within its mainland area and that posterity will be better served as a consequence.

I simply want to comment a bit on the testimony of my good friend, Mr. Foster.

Since this proposal was made, an economic study was made, under the sponsorship of the National Park Service, and from that economic study we learned that within 4 years, as a result of the establishment of a national seashore, there would be an increase in visitations of a million and a half people. That would be a million and a half; our present visitation days, according to the figures given by the Cape Cod Chamber of Commerce are 1 million.

Over a period of 15 years, there would be 10 million visitation days to the national park as compared with only 6 million visitation days if there were not a national park.

Now, the National Park Service, I am sure, I know the gentlemen and I know it is their intention to preserve the historical significance of the Cape to prevent the widespread use of beaches by people who leave beer cans and so forth and so on, but nevertheless, when it becomes known that there is a national seashore on Cape Cod, that is going to mean only one thing to the people around Boston and Providence, and so forth, that is going to mean only that there are now more public beaches on Cape Cod.

I think it is going to take a tremendous amount of policing on the part of the National Park Service to make sure that their objectives are carried out. The National Park Service certainly cannot control the publicity that it gets and it does get such a tremendous amount of it in the national magazines. I just hold up for your observation the latest that I have read on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

You will notice that in that illustration the principal item is a very charming girl in an abbreviated bathing suit. Now that is what we fear——

[Laughter.]

I hope my wife hears that statement. We fear that the national seashore—personally, I would much rather have it called a national historic site. We fear that is what a national seashore is going to mean to these millions of people, and we feel that of the extra million and a half visitation days in the next 4 years, the great number of them are going through our fine residential areas of Chatham to see this small area on Morris Island, and they are going to do much more harm to Chatham than the island can do good for the National Park Service.

So, also in relation to Mr. Foster, I would call his attention to the fact that on a hot summer day, despite the fact that there are State forests immediately adjacent to Boston, which are the Blue Hills, that you will see the traffic pouring through the Blue Hills, the park part of Boston, to get to the public beaches.

Despite the fact in the State we have a great number of forest areas preserved, when the weather gets hot the people are naturally going to visit the beaches.

Thank you very much. The only thing I can say is that if this committee does give due consideration, and I am sure they will, to the legitimate requests of the lower Cape selectmen, that they in fact will, through Congress, be able to present to President-Elect Kennedy a bill for his signature, a bill through which you sensibly now, while the opportunity remains, will have preserved for America and for our people a priceless heritage to be enjoyed many times over not only by this generation, but by those that will follow. And that is the bill which I think President-Elect Kennedy expects to come as a result of his own suggestion in his introduction.

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. I hope I haven't taken too much of your time. I was allowed an hour. I didn't use an hour.

(Statement of Mr. McNeece follows:)

STATEMENT BY THE TOWN OF CHATHAM AS PRESENTED BY ROBERT A. MCNEECE

On June 22, 1960, the town of Chatham submitted a brief, to this subcommittee, together with a supplementary statement and other documents setting forth its positions in relation to the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore.

This statement is intended to relate the pertinent areas of Chatham to the criterion stated by the National Park Service as justification for the establishment of a Cape Cod National Seashore and the tests this proposed seashore should meet as imposed by the sponsors of Senate bill S. 2636 and House bill H.R. 9050.

In its brochure "Cape Cod National Seashore—A Proposal" the National Park Service described the proposed area as of "national significance, scenic, scientific or historic, so great, so precious, as to make its preservation the concern of all Americans—this is the criterion for areas to be included within the National Park System."

When, as a result of this proposal, Senators Kennedy and Saltonstall and Representative Keith introduced companion bills to establish the proposed seashore, each attached certain tests that the seashore must meet before, in their opinion, its establishment would be justified.

In his remarks on the floor of the Senate, speaking on behalf of himself and Senator Saltonstall, Senator Kennedy stated "Each of us has felt that a national seashore was justified only on a strong showing that this was the most effective means of maintaining the historic way of life and the scenic integrity of the Cape." Later he stated: "* * * it seems important to meet the legitimate interests and sentiments of the existing residents."

Senator Saltonstall in the introductory paragraph of S. 2636 stated: "The authors of the bill know from long personal experience * * * that lower Cape Cod cannot be considered solely as a geographical area with certain physical characateristics. The lower Cape must also be viewed as a way of life—a culture—which, though conditioned by its environment, finds its essence in the people who have lived and are living there. This bill seeks to preserve the way of life which these people have established and maintained on the Cape."

Representative Keith stated, in effect, that the results of the legislation should be such that a national seashore and the individuality of the Cape can exist together and serve each other with mutual benefit.

Thus we have a proposal by the National Park Service based on a certain criterion and an expression by our legislators to go along with this proposal, provided it meets certain tests.

The town of Chatham has studied the proposal and the tests it must meet carefully and in a cooperative spirit. It decided that the Nauset Beach area did meet the criterion established by the National Park Service and, though it does not concede that it entirely meets the tests imposed by the legislators, it has concluded that under proper safeguards and conditions, it would be disposed to agree to the inclusion of the Nauset area within the national seashore.

Monomoy Island, though meeting the criterion of the National Park Service, is at present preserved as a wildlife refuge and for limited recreational uses. However, because of its inaccessibility by land, separated from Morris Island by an ever-widening breach now some three-fourths of a mile wide, its inclusion as a part of the national seashore on maps appearing in brochures, issued by the

National Park Service, would have the effect of attracting tourists through the town only to find that it must be viewed from a distance. This added traffic burden certainly would conflict with the legitimate interests of the citizens of Chatham.

Morris Island does not, in the opinion of Chatham, meet the criterion established by the National Park Service to justify its inclusion in the national seashore. Chatham cannot agree that this small area of land is of national signficance—scenic, scientific, or historic, so great, so precious as to make its preservation a concern to all Americans. Essentially, all that distinguishes Morris Island from many other undeveloped areas of Chatham, is a white cedar bog. This cedar bog is to be preserved in perpetuity as well as other areas of marshland through signed agreements between the owners and the conservation commission of the town of Chatham. Not only does Morris Island fail to meet the criterion of the National Park Service, but it fails to meet the tests of the sponsors of S. 2636 and H.R. 9050 namely that it should be included "only on a strong showing that it meets the legitimate interests and sentiments of the existing residents." When developed in the fine manner planned, the area will yield about $50,000 annually in tax revenue and will provide about $750,000 in wages for our building and landscape trades. These figures certainly are the legitimate interest of the citizens of Chatham. As to the sentiment of Chatham citizens, the town has on two occasions voted against the inclusion of Morris Island; once unanimously and at another time by a ratio of more than 45 to 1. There is no land approach to the Morris and Monomoy Islands areas other than through Chatham's fine residential districts and if these areas are included then, certainly, "the national seashore and the town of Chatham cannot coexist and serve each other with mutual benefit."

Relating in general the criterion established by the National Park Service and the tests imposed by the legislators to Chatham, the town is convinced that Chatham as a whole is, in fact, of such scenic and historic stature as to justify its protection as a relatively unspoiled, typical cape township, that it possesses innumerable examples of preserved or restored Cape Cod architecture, that it truly reflects a way of life, a culture which should be preserved as an inspiration for future generations. Again referring to the national seashore brochure, it calls attention to "the historic charm which surrounds the proposed national seashore complementing its natural scenes." It adds emphasis to this statement with an illustration of the doorway of the Old Atwood House in Chatham. The retention of the charm of the towns adjacent to the national seashore may well mean as much to posterity as the national seashore itself. The charm of Chatham is bound to suffer from any national attraction which congests its residential areas with tourists or sightseers such as visit the Cape Hatteras National Seashore in such great numbers.

In the very artistic and inspiring brochure issued by the National Park Service entitled "That the Past Shall Live," Dr. Conrad Wirth stated: "The preservation of American historical sites and buildings is not a task which can be accomplished by the Federal Government alone. It must be a cooperative local, State, and National effort. Government agencies at all levels, private preservations organizations, and individual citizens all must do their part."

Chatham believes that through its own history of preservation of colonial homes, churches, windmills, monuments and parks its preservation for public use of about 500 acres of beach and shore areas and its vigorous program to conserve open space and marsh areas, it is doing its part at the local level to cooperate with the programs of the National Park Service.

Located on the elbow of the cape, comparatively remote from the main cape traffic arteries, Chatham believes that it can achieve its own preservation objectives and implement the overall purpose of national park legislation if no national attraction is established within its mainland area, and that posterity will be better served as a consequence.

Respectfully submitted.

Everett C. Small,
Robert A. McNeece,
David F. Ryder,
Selectmen, Town of Chatham.

Eastham, Mass., *December 16, 1960.*

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you, Mr. McNeece.

Our next witness is Mr. Horton of Truro. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF IRVING A. HORTON, CHAIRMAN OF SELECTMEN, TRURO, MASS.

Mr. HORTON. Madam Chairman and members of your staff, following the various meetings which we have had lately which have been quite extensive, we proposed the following brief for the town of Truro.

My name is Irving A. Horton. I am chairman of the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Truro. I am speaking on behalf of myself and the other members of the Truro National Park Committee consisting of the board of selectmen and planning board.

Most of our case was presented by Mr. Duarte at the Senate hearing last December and by Mr. Worthington in Washington, January 1960, so I will try not to be repetitious.

We would like to reemphasize the fact that we and many others are seriously concerned with the economic impact on Truro and the other cape towns. We cannot see otherwise than that some pretty drastic adjustments are in order for us.

As a tax assessor I, personally, am very much afraid of a loss in tax revenue at a time when municipal expenses are increasing. I cannot urge too strongly that provision for adequate tax compensation be incorporated in the final bill.

A problem we would like to bring to your attention is that of policing the area. At present, in a brisk summer, our police department in Truro is overstrained. We wonder what the result would be with the considerably greater influx of travelers that a national park is likely to bring. Other town departments such as fire, roads, refuse disposal are bound to have added problems.

It is our feeling, perhaps, erroneous, that the extremely large proposed taking in Truro—75 percent—may have been instigated by the fact that at the time most of the bills were drawn, Truro was without zoning ordinances. This lack on our part has since been remedied, it appears to us that adequate zoning laws—we think ours are adequate—largely obviates the need of an oversized park.

We have worked out a plan, which we hope will be acceptable, whereby the populated and built-up valleys of the town of Truro are not included in the park. To us, it seems these valleys occupied as residential areas since the 1700's are not a proper part of a project emphasizing natural resources and they could well be taken out without harming the overall value of the project.

I believe that even if the valleys were taken out, too much of the town of Truro is involved in the park and that a majority of the town would welcome a more extensive cutback.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you, Mr. Horton.

Our next witness is Mr. Murray of Orleans.

Mr. HORTON. May I at this time thank you for the courtesies extended to us yesterday in our trip by helicopter and automobile, and I hope your trip back will be pleasant. We will appreciate your giving us consideration and I hope you will.

Mrs. PFOST. Will you please give your full name for the record, Mr. Murray?

STATEMENT OF FRANKLIN S. MURRAY, SELECTMAN, ORLEANS, MASS.

Mr. MURRAY. I am Franklin S. Murray, selectman of the town of Orleans.

Madam Chairman and members of the committee, Congressman Keith and members of the staff, Orleans finds itself in a unique position in this proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park in that all of the area that is proposed to be included in the park, except 2 small islands are either under town ownership or being negotiated for. Town meeting in 1954 gave us permission to start acquiring all of the ocean beach from the Eastham town line to the Chatham town line. We have been progressing steadily in that direction ever since. So we do not have the problems that other towns have of land areas, especially populated land areas, to be included in the park.

We strongly support our neighboring towns in their request for boundary adjustments so as to give them more room to expand, more room to live and breath, and Chatham with their problem of Morris Island, which is not contiguous to the park, but is separated by the water barrier from the other part of the proposed park.

So, therefore, I am going to take very little of your time. I want to thank you for your courtesy of viewing our area, of coming to the cape to listen to our problems because I think the other towns can use the time to much better advantage than the town of Orleans.

I thank you.

(Statement of Mr. Murray follows:)

BRIEF FOR ORLEANS ON PROPOSED CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK

The Orleans Board of Selectmen submit the following background information and opinions in respect to H.R. 9050:

Orleans is situated at the intersection of the two main highways serving Cape Cod (Routes 6 and 28) and is therefore easily reached from anywhere on Cape Cod. This easy accessability has made Orleans the shopping center for this section of the lower cape and the adjoining towns to a large extent depend on our town for much of their trading and services. Thus, during the summer months a large volume of vacationers from the surrounding area converge on Orleans for their needs both mercantile and recreational. Not the least of our recreational assets is Orleans Beach situated on the Atlantic Ocean side of the town proper. Unlike most of the ocean beaches on the lower cape, Orleans Beach is readily accessible without encountering steep bluffs, cliffs, or dunes between the auto parking area and the beach proper. For a vacationer traveling from the canal down the length of the cape, Orleans Beach is the first beach actually on the ocean that he will arrive at. Because of these unique geographic and topographic features, Orleans Beach attracts vacationers from all over the cape and adjacent communities.

To properly evaluate the part of Orleans that is proposed to be included in the national seashore park we will consider: (1) The beachland (Orleans Beach) and (2) the upland (property entirely owned by the Payson family).

In 1926 by action of the town meeting the town acquired ownership of 2,000 feet of Orleans Beach to be used for a parking area and general recreational uses and constructed a small building to house restroom and bath stall facilities under the supervision of the park commission. Subsequent to 1926 there have been a number of town meeting actions for the purpose of acquiring more land and also to appropriate moneys to improve the facilities and enlarge to parking capacity. Probably the most significant of these actions was the action taken in 1957 directing the selectmen "to purchase, accept as a gift, or take by eminent domain all of the beach and meadow land not now owned by the town of Orleans, between the Eastham Town line on the north and the Chatham Town line on the south." Working with the town counsel the selectmen have made considerable progress in carrying out this vote. Title to all of the beach and meadow land south of the town parking lot now rests in the town of Orleans; some of this has been accomplished by negotiation, some by outright gift; eminent domain had to be resorted to in some instances. As of December 1, 1959, the town has paid one court award and there are two other cases awaiting trial presumably in the spring. We are still in the process of acquiring the properties involved and have not exercised our authority under eminent domain on the section from town of Orleans parking lot north to Eastham line. The reason for this is due to negotiations being carried on with the owners involved on the basis of the town acquiring legal title by purchase at a nominal price, incorporating what the owners feel are protective restrictions on the land in question. Unless these negotiations are productive of final settlement at an early date we plan to take eminent domain action.

In the area from town of Chatham line we have by negotiations accepted deeds to some pieces of property, including buildings, these deeds specifying use of the building and 1 acre of land to the grantor for 15 years or for life, whichever the greater. If and when these properties are transferred to the Park Service, the deed agreements would still hold. Cost to the town for land acquisition to December 1, 1959, is $23,857.14; for improvements, $19,294.27.

The administrative policy of operating the beach has always been an important factor in its popularity. The beach has always been open to the public 24 hours a day and 12 months of the year, with no restrictions on fishing, hunting (within the seasons prescribed by State or Federal law), or any other activity of a recreational nature. The restroom and bathhouse facilities are open each year without charge from mid-June until mid-September; a nominal parking fee for automobiles of nontaxpayers was instituted in 1955, effective only during July and August. The most current figures covering the period from June 27, 1959, to September 9, 1959, show that Orleans Beach accommodated 131,750 automobiles carrying 287,250 people; there is no accurate way of estimating the number of people who enjoyed the beach during the balance of the year. The sole vehicular approach to the parking lot at Orleans Beach is presently adequate, but with any substantial increase of traffic will present a problem during the summer months.

The areas in question are among the most accessible of any areas in the proposed park and lend themselves ideally to expansion of facilities for seashore use.

If the Orleans areas are incorporated in the park there undoubtedly would be substantial expansion and improvement of the facilities there, which in turn would promptly create a serious problem not now existent. We refer to the present road access to the area in question. The necessary improvement of access would involve substantial land damage and road construction. This we do not feel that the town could assume. It is conceivable that when this projected situation developed that the Park Service would necessarily have to assume the obligation of improved access, but we wish to record this potential at this time.

The second consideration regarding the property included within the proposed national seashore park is the private property. In the case of Orleans the private property involved is all upland and title is vested in one family. May we, herewith, submit for your consideration a portion of a letter dated August 6, 1959, and signed by William L. Payson. Mr. Payson is the senior male of the Payson family.

"In 1886 my grandfather bought Pochet Island, Little Pochet Island, Sampson's Island, and Hog Island at the northeast corner of Pleasant Bay in Orleans, the only upland in the town of Orleans included in the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore. From then on he, his four children and their descendants, five generations all told, have spent their vacations on Pochet Island. The place means more to us and our children and our grandchildren than any other spot and we don't want to lose it.

"Pochet Island itself is separated from the beach by a creek 300 yards or so back from the beach. Sampson's and Hog Islands are even further back from the beach, and separated by a very broad creek therefrom. Little Pochet Island is contiguous to the beach.

"The Payson family has no inclination to develop these lands. We care too much for them in their present wild state. We have four summer residences on Pochet Island, one of them fairly large, another a very old story-and-a-half Cape Cod house, and the other two are camps, various outbuildings, including a boathouse, and a tennis court. Nothing at all fancy, but adequate for our purposes. I, myself, now spend about one-half my time in a year-round house that I have built on the mainland nearby. I can truthfully say that I am more interested than most in preserving Cape Cod as I have always known it.

"I believe that the Great Outer Beach from Provincetown to Monomoy should become public lands for the benefit of all. I heartily approve the act of the town of Orleans in taking the entire beach in Orleans and have, on behalf of the Payson family, offered to give Little Pochet Island, the contiguous piece of upland referred to above, to the town for park purposes. I hope that the other towns will do what Orleans is doing, but if the towns won't or can't make parks out of their beaches I hope the Federal Government will step in. However, it does not seem right that so much upland, including so many houses, should be taken from their owners."

The following is a list from the assessor's records showing the parcels owned by the Payson family and proposed to be included within the park boundaries.

	Acres	Amount
Little Pochet Island: Land only	2.51	$1,300
Pochet Island:		
Land	139.5	8,760
Buildings		11,815
Sampson Island: Land	30.0	900
Hog Island: Land	12.0	940
Total	184.01	23,715

The assessed values represent one-half of the actual value as of 1954 as established by an independent revaluation program conducted by the J. M. Cleminshaw Co., for the town of Orleans in 1954–55.

At first glance H.R. 9050 is a magnificent piece of legislation insofar as it affects the town of Orleans. Of particular interest is section 2(a) "* * * may be acquired only with the concurrence of the owner. * * *" Since the town of Orleans is governed by the town meeting we, the selectmen, interpret this to mean that concurrence would mean a vote of assent at a town meeting. We submit the following questions upon which we would require clarification or complete agreements before submitting the proposal to a town meeting.

1. What reinbursement could the town expect for the acquisition and improvement costs at Orleans Beach?
2. What would be the administrative policy of the Park Service as to the freedom of use that the public has heretofore enjoyed?
3. What would be the administrative policy of the National Park Service as to the immediate and future development of improvements to and at Orleans Beach? What, if anything, would the Park Service do to combat erosion?
4. Anticipating a greater influx of traffic when Orleans Beach may be under the administration of the Park Service; what relief could the town expect from the Government for the necessary and inevitable road widening or construction adequate to cope with the greater number of cars attracted by a national seashore park?
5. What cooperation, financial or otherwise, could the town expect to get for the planning assistance—economic, land-use, and related subjects—that would become necessary in the areas outside the perimeter of the proposed park? What assistance could the area as a whole expect?
6. Since many of the beach parcels now in the town of Orleans ownership contain restrictions or reservations for life tenancy, and so forth, what would be the attitude of the Park Service to these deed restrictions and/or reservations?

These are some of the questions which will be asked by the voters in town meeting. There will no doubt be others. Upon the answers will depend what action the people will take in the town meetings on the question of turning over the beaches they own to the National Park Service. The people of Orleans have already shown through their town meetings that they believe in public ownership of all of their ocean-front beach. They will be unlikely to turn over to the Department of the Interior ownership and control of these beaches which they have won for the town unless they are given definite and enforcible assurances that the Orleans Beach will continue, as it now is, to be governed for the benefit of all the people including themselves.

To summarize: The opinions stated above are the opinions of the Orleans Board of Selectmen after careful consideration of the bill (H.R. 9050) and after conversations with many of our resident and nonresident taxpayers. Although we agree with the spirit of the bill we urge strongly that our questions may be answered at an early date. We further hope that early consideration may be given to the particularly difficult economic problem of our neighboring towns.

Franklin S. Murray, *Chairman,*
Arthur R. Finlay,
Richard H. Adams,
Board of Selectmen, Town of Orleans, Mass.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you very much, Mr. Murray.

Our next witness is Mr. Hurd of Eastham.

STATEMENT OF PRINCE H. HURD, JR., SELECTMAN, EASTHAM, MASS.

Mr. Hurd. Madam Chairman, gentlemen of the committee, my name is Prince H. Hurd, Jr., a member of the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Eastham.

The town of Eastham in its preparation for the past hearings, as well as this hearing, has been very consistent in the thought and theory that it has offered in order to seek a just solution of the proposed national seashore legislation. Our board has offered for the consideration of the congressional committee three distinct areas which would remain as highly residential areas for the further growth of our town. One of these areas was not originally included in the National Park Service proposal, as offered by Dr. Conrad Wirth, at a meeting in this hall better than 1 year ago.

The other two areas which we suggest should remain within the town confines for residential use of a private nature do not actually warrant consideration by the National Park Service for park purposes.

You will note when you study the map of the town of Eastham's proposal that these two areas lie at the westerly edge of the proposal in relation to Eastham. These are heavily wooded areas, they do not reach out to the coastal area which the National Park Service seeks to preserve for future generations.

I would like also to add that in these three areas that the town of Eastham seeks to keep for residential use only that there are at the present time some 75 permanent and well-established private homes in the area, that it, as has been suggested by previous witnesses, be taken into consideration by your board that what we seek to preserve for the town is already well developed.

Then again, what we have submitted is desirable for park purposes, we have in our plan left for the park purposes. The park service promotes that the Salt Pond area would be a prime entrance point to the overall park. We have left this in recognizing the need of a prime entrance point.

Then, the areas along our marshes, Nauset Bay, Salt Pond Bay, and along the Atlantic Ocean, we have not attempted to have withdrawn from the park's proposal recognizing that if we ourselves were out to negotiate and to acquire a park for conservation and preservation purposes, that these areas would be of primary importance to us in our acquisitions.

I cannot strongly enough urge that what areas we have suggested be deleted from the park for residential purposes is not needed for park purposes, but the area is most definitely needed for the future growth of the town of Eastham.

I will not offer at this time to go into the statistical background supporting our position. A formal brief was filed in the June hearings in Washington showing the land use in Eastham and projected thoughts and projected theories and on the ultimate growth of our town.

It has come to our board that it is not enough for the town of Eastham to state to a congressional committee that we will, if you would move your boundary lines back, put this land that is deleted from the plan to private residential use. That does not give Congress and the proponents of this bill any guarantee that such would be the case.

The town of Eastham, therefore, is prepared to offer that the existing boundaries remain the same in our town for purposes of the original bill to be enacted. However, we submit that under section 1 a new clause can be added in the form of an amendment which describes in metes and bounds the area that we propose for a highly residential use, can be inserted in the bill, that under the provisions of section 5 a suitable standard of zoning as called for by the Secretary of the Interior can apply to these areas. Therefore, it would be the responsibility of the towns to adopt such zoning under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and at that time the areas could then be retained by the town for private residential ownership.

We feel that such a proposal as this which would apply to all of the towns as well as our own, by meeting our responsibilities to the overall need of the preservation of our coastal area, could then maintain the integrity of those towns which are over 300 years old. It would also maintain the integrity of the overall park land called for under the proposals.

I want to thank you very much for your consideration in hearing me.

(Mr. Hurd's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN, TOWN OF EASTHAM

INTRODUCTION

The position of this board with reference to the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park is substantially the same as its previous statements which are a part of the record of the Senate hearings on December 9, 1959, and June 21, 1960, and the House of Representatives hearings on June 21, 1960.

There will be no undue repetition in this statement, for you have the basic statistics supporting our position before you.

However, this board is confident that its suggested residential buffer zone can be spelled out in the bill so as to protect the integrity of both the proposed park and the town, as well as place a responsibility upon the town to enact a suitable zoning bylaw. The same would hold true of all the towns involved.

Thus, a compatible balance between the towns and the park would be guaranteed within the wording of the act, and failure of a town to enact such a bylaw would, in effect, forfeit its right to retain the desired residential areas as proposed at this and prior hearings.

In addition, the proposal offered here would be in keeping with the soundness of each town's proposal of boundary changes. For if a town were unwilling to adopt suitable zoning for its residential area within the boundaries of the park, then the proposal's suggestion that the Federal Government is the only suitable agency to preserve a portion of Cape Cod would be sustained. But, the failure of one or more of the towns to adapt its proposals to the soundness of the basic purpose of the changed boundaries would not then be sufficient cause for another town's adaptation to be ignored.

Suggested amendments to the act incorporating the foregoing are included as appendixes to this statement for the subcommittee's consideration.

PROTECTION FOR INDIVIDUAL PROPERTY OWNER

The proposed legislation permits the Secretary of the Interior to acquire privately owned property within the boundaries of the park by various means, it provides for the appropriation and use of moneys with which to acquire such property, and it provides for the negotiation and terms of such acquisition.

But in no instance does the legislation require action by the Secretary.

The influence is that a property owner affected by the legislation will be quite content to retain ownership of his property, and that he will not be inconvenienced by the establishment of the park. However, it is submitted that many of the property owners directly involved with the act are deeply concerned over the future and what it holds for them. They feel that no additional building can be undertaken on their property without fear of condemnation, whether the construction is for their family needs or not.

Further, there are those in the unfortunate position of financial worry. There is a definite deterrent to sales within the area proposed for the park. Perhaps the person could solve his financial problems if his property were readily salable. The bill calls for the appropriation of money for the acquisition, but there is no guarantee that our Congress will so appropriate.

Hence, many small property owners are involved, each with a stake for his future vitally concerned.

The legislation must have as a condition precedent sufficient funds to negotiate with those individuals who, in good faith, wish to negotiate, and a time limit must be placed on the Secretary to so negotiate.

BOUNDARY REVISION

Our board of selectmen has placed on the record of these hearings a proposed boundary revision, which would serve as a residential buffer zone between the town proper and the proposed park. This zone is delineated on the maps used by this subcommittee in its deliberations.

Considerable thought has gone into the proposal of this board, both with a view to the needs of the town and still respecting the purposes for which this park would be created.

The town finds itself, if the act is passed as drafted, in the position of soon reaching a saturation point as to land use. The statistics in support of this are in the prior record.

At the same time, the town recognizes the need and desirability of preserving a portion of the shoreline and coastal area for future generations as a part of our heritage.

Therefore, the town of Eastham, as well as the other towns, have offered for consideration boundary revisions. An examination of the Eastham proposal offers something to both the town and the park, but without, we submit, damage to either.

The Salt Pond area is unchanged, for it is recognized that it offers the most suitable and logical location for an entrance to the proposed park. Also, the desirable scenic areas along the marshes and coast are preserved for undisputed park purposes.

The areas that the town submits must be retained for residential purposes were either not incorporated in the original National Park Service proposal or do not contain scenic and historic sites so desirable for a park of this nature.

However, zoned for a highly residential use, these areas would quickly become desirable for private residential use. Their abutting the proposed park would assure homeowners therein of the protection of open spaces we all desire on the cape.

Further, this residential buffer zone area would serve as a most suitable transition for the park visitor.

We fear that, without such a buffer zone, the future visitor to the proposed park will travel from a highly commercial zone, outside the park area catering to the needs of the visitor to the park, to the park proper. Such a use of Cape Cod property would be intolerable to both the town and the park, for under such a situation the integrity of both would suffer to an undetermined but great extent.

But, with this residential buffer zone, a desirable result will be obtained for all concerned. The town of Eastham, we feel, is entitled to retain its integrity. It has resisted an undesirable use of its land, through zoning, particularly along its coastal area, so that this proposed legislation can now be introduced into our Congress. Had it developed to the point that all the lands were occupied by commercial development, the Congress would not be entertaining this particular act.

Thus, our orderly growth should not be penalized at this date.

Further, some 75 homes are established and occupied within the area of this proposed residential buffer zone. That is to say that the area is already partially developed and will lend itself well to the buffer zone, to say nothing of the money saved in the acquisition of this area.

Your attention is also directed to the fact that we did not run the buffer zone to the roads that will undoubtedly be used in leading into and through the park, which would have left residential development on one side and park use on the other. We feel that the park purposes can best be served by having these roads entirely within the proposed park area. Hence a suitable setting back of the buffer zone was adopted to better preserve park purposes.

But, after due consideration, and in all fairness to the park proposal, it was felt that to request the boundary revision upon mere statement that the area proposed as a buffer zone would be put to only residential purposes would not in the end guarantee such private residential use.

And further, it is quite possible that one town's suggestion for residential zones is proper and suitable to the overall integrity of the park, whereas another town's is not. Such a situation should not defeat that town which suggests a suitable residential area.

Therefore, it is submitted that the town of Eastham's buffer zone area can be described in the act under section 1 thereof, and would remain as park property until such time as it has adopted suitable zoning under section 5 of the act. Then, under section 6 of the act, the certificate can be obtained for title and sale purposes.

A similar description of each town's residential area within the boundaries of the park could be made a part of section 1 of the act.

Thus both the town involved and the park are protected by the act itself.

This statement contains an appendix defining the Eastham residential buffer zone, plus an appendix, under section 5, setting forth the general outline of the zoning requirements.

We offer these as amendments to the bill which would create and establish the Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

APPENDIX I

DESCRIPTION OF RESIDENTIAL BUFFER ZONE WITHIN THE TOWN OF EASTHAM, SUBMITTED AS AN AMENDMENT TO SECTION 1 OF THE ACT

Section 1. (c) In the Town of Eastham, the area lying between the westerly boundary line described in subsection (b) and the hereinafter described boundary line shall be known as the residential buffer zone: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of section 5(e) et sequitur of said Act are first adopted and approved by the Secretary of the Interior:

Commencing at the easterly right-of-way line of a power transmission line at the Eastham-Wellfleet line;

Thence in a general southeasterly direction to a point on the northerly sideline of Cable Road, said point being approximately five-eighths of one mile west of the high-water mark of the Atlantic Ocean;

Thence in a general southerly direction, running parallel to said Atlantic Ocean, to a point three hundred (300) feet north of the intersection of Little Creek Road and Doane Road;

Thence in a general westerly direction in a line parallel to and three hundred (300) feet north of the northerly sideline of said Doane Road to a point three hundred (300) feet west of the westerly sideline of Nauset Road;

Thence in a general southerly and westerly direction in a line parallel to and three hundred (300) feet west and north of the westerly and northerly sideline of said Nauset Road to the easterly sideline of Schoolhouse Road;

Thence southerly along the easterly sideline of said Schoolhouse Road to its intersection with the southerly sideline of said Nauset Road;

Thence westerly along the southerly sideline of said Nauset Road to its intersection with the easterly right-of-way line of U.S. Route No. 6;

Thence southerly along the easterly right-of-way line of said Route No. 6 to a point west of the mouth of a small river that runs from Salt Pond Bay to Salt Pond;

Thence southerly and easterly to the high-water mark at the mouth of said river;

Thence in a general southerly direction along the high-water mark to a small stream approximately one-tenth of one mile beyond Governor Prence Road extended;

Thence southeasterly to the Orleans-Eastham town line;

Thence along the Orleans-Eastham town line to the southerly tip of Stony Island.

APPENDIX II

OUTLINE OF ZONING STANDARDS APPLICABLE TO RESIDENTIAL AREA WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE PARK AND AS DESCRIBED UNDER SECTION 1 OF THE ACT, SUBMITTED AS AN AMENDMENT TO SECTION 5 OF THE ACT

Section 5. (e) As soon after the enactment of this Act as may be practicable, the Secretary shall issue regulations specifying standards for approval by him of zoning bylaws for purposes of residential use within the boundaries of the park as described in section 1 (c) of this Act. The Secretary may issue amended regulations therefor specifying standards for approval by him of zoning bylaws whenever he shall consider such amended regulations to be desirable due to changed or unforeseen conditions. The Secretary shall approve any zoning bylaw and any amendment to any approved zoning bylaw submitted to him which conforms to the standards contained in the regulations in effect at the time of the adoption by the town of such bylaw or such amendment. Such approval shall not be withdrawn or revoked, nor shall its effect be altered for the purposes herein by issuance of any such amended regulations after the date of such approval, so long as such bylaw or such amendment remains in effect as approved.

(f) The standards specified in such regulations and amended regulations for approval of any zoning bylaw or zoning bylaw amendment shall contribute to the effect of (1) establishing a highly residential area within the boundaries of the park which is situated within the town adopting such bylaw; and (2) promoting the development therein in accordance with the purposes of the area so designated, by means of acreage, frontage, and setback requirements and other provisions which may be required by such regulations to be included in a zoning bylaw consistent with the laws of Massachusetts.

(g) No zoning bylaw or amendment of a zoning bylaw shall be approved by the Secretary which (1) contains any provision which he may consider adverse to such residential development; or (2) fails to have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under and any exception made to the application of such bylaw or amendment.

(h) If any improved property, with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation has been suspended by reason of the adoption and approval, in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, of a zoning bylaw applicable to such property within the residential zone—

> (1) is made the subject of a variance under or an exception to such bylaw, which variance or exception fails to conform or is in any manner opposed to or inconsistent with any applicable standard contained in the regulations issued pursuant to this section and in effect at the time of the passage of such bylaw (but if such bylaw has been amended at the time of the passage of the most recent amendment), or
>
> (2) upon or with respect to which there occurs any use, commencing after the date of the publication by the Secretary of such regulation, which fails to conform or is in any manner opposed to or inconsistent with any applicable standard contained in such regulations (but no use which is in conformity with the provisions of such bylaw shall be held to fail to conform or be opposed to or inconsistent with any such standard),

the Secretary may, at any time and in his discretion, terminate the suspension of his authority to acquire such improved property within the residential area by condemnation: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary may agree with the owner or owners of such property to refrain from the exercise of the said authority during such time and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem to be in the best interests of the development of the residential area and the preservation of the park.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you, Mr. Hurd.

Our next witness is Mr. Frazier of Wellfleet.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES E. FRAZIER, JR., CHAIRMAN OF SELECTMEN, WELLFLEET, MASS.

Mr. FRAZIER. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Charles E. Frazier, Jr., chairman of the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Wellfleet.

As your records will indicate, the town has filed a brief with a Congressman suggesting modification of the proposed national park. The town has been consistent in its approach to this particular problem and our position today is basically the same as it has been since the original hearings which were held here approximately a year ago. I understand from your consultant that copies of my brief are available to you now, but in view of some of the questions propounded to Mr. Foster by the honorable Representative from Colorado, I believe I should point out certain factors that are important in considering the establishment of a national park on Cape Cod.

I would like to point out that the proposed taking in the town of Wellfleet, including the land within the pond, would consist of 8,010 acres, that the total acreage in the town of Wellfleet is 12,700 acres. This means that in our particular town the national park would propose to take approximately 75 percent of the total land area.

I would like to point out that the town would have approximately 4,700 acres of land left provided the proposed park was established. Of this amount approximately half is marshland, incapable of being developed or used for residential purposes, which means that the town of Wellfleet would have approximately 2,300 acres of land on which to exist. Of that 2,300 acres of land approximately a year ago through the generosity of the Old Dominion Foundation, the town lost approximately 400 acres of land which was given to the Audubon Society and therefore, taken out of the tax roll. So that if the proposal is established as suggested, the town of Wellfleet would have approximately 1,900 acres of land on which to exist.

I would like to point out in connection with my brief that, approximately a year ago by actual count this park proposal would take in the town of Wellfleet, 355 buildings or dwellings that are occupied either on a year-round or on a seasonal basis, and that the present assessed value of these dwellings and the land is $1,874,000 which is 36 percent of the total valuation of the town of Wellfleet. This assessed value of our town is predicated on the basis of approximately 30 percent valuation for buildings and approximately 5 to 10 percent valuation for lands. These same dwellings and lands, according to valuations placed by real estate experts of the locality show that the value of the buildings to be taken in Wellfleet would be $4,313,000. This figure is approximately one-third less than the value suggested by the National Park Service with respect to buildings in this particular area. So I submit that this is a rather modest figure and not exaggerated.

The value of the land is $6,852,000. The value of that land is arrived at by permitting a value of $1,000 per acre for 6,852 acres. Now, it is a matter of common knowledge in this locality that a thousand dollars per acre for seashore land and land adjoining ponds is approximately 25 percent of the real value, because any land adjoining the ocean or being on a pond, or having a sight view has at the present time a value of not less than $5,000 an acre, and I point to a situation in a residential nearby community where seven-eighths of an acre of land on the ocean sold for $17,500. So that the value of a thousand dollars an acre is a moderate value.

This would mean, assuming that these moderate values could be used as the real value of the property in the area, that it would cost the Government approximately $12 million to take the dwellings and land in the town of Wellfleet where we are only concerned according to their figures with a taking of 5,600 acres and the entire proposal is for 30,000 acres plus the land and buildings thereon.

It is very amusing to me as an attorney to observe the valuations that some of these services put on land for the purpose of taking and then find out afterwards when the Government or Commonwealth or the agency that has to pay has to raise the money, that we are not talking about $16 million, but that we are talking about something that would probably be 10 times that amount.

Now, my good friend, Mr. Foster, of the Department of Natural Resources of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, should be well aware of that situation, because when they made the taking for the Pilgrim Spring that he mentions of 1,200 acres, and they assigned at value of that for the purpose of the taking of $20,000, they were not consistent with the policy of fair value. I mention that instance because I happened to be an assistant attorney general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and I was assigned to defend the Commonwealth with respect to the payment of land damages on that case. And Hon. Joseph Welch represented the party. Mr. Welch produced four real estate experts to testify that 744 acres of that 1,200 acres of land had a value of anywhere from $47,000 to $731,000, and as attorney for the Commonwealth, I had two experts who were able to testify that according to the opinion of the department, the land had a maximum value of $20,000. I point that out only to show that this is a big proposition, and the honorable Representative from Colorado, apparently being a member of the judiciary, is aware that there might be problems here in connection with the Federal Government being a partner with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In connection with land ownership of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I would like to point out that on the map where it says Race Point, running up to the Truro line, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts owns that land, and that land is known as the province lands, that allegedly consists of 4,700 acres. Title to it is in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It was purchased by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts over 300 years ago from two Indians. The persons who live in Provincetown live there by virtue of squatter's rights, and under various acts of the legislature.

In order for the Commonwealth to pass title to that to the Federal Government, it would require an act of the legislature in Massachusetts. The State understands the department of natural resources owns the Pilgrim Spring land, which is the land adjoining the little circle shown on your map, 1,200 acres. There is an intervening piece of land in there of 1,800 acres that the commissioner of natural resources proposed to take on behalf of the Commonwealth and then have the Commonwealth donate it to the Federal Government. Those three parcels, when put together, would give the Commonwealth of Massachusetts approximately 7,500 acres of contiguous land, which area is the area that has been described as the dual country, the area that must be preserved, the area with the scenic beauty, the area which is described in all of the pictures that are shown by the department.

The only other areas that are described in the brochure put out by the department are the pond lands in Wellfleet.

I submit that if this problem is too great a problem for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that a certain degree of care should be given to considering the extent of the area that the Federal Government can take. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has been on a program within the last several years of establishing beach areas in addition to the areas that Mr. Foster talks about. There is in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a division of beaches, and within the last 6 months on behalf of the Commonwealth and on behalf of the division of beaches, I have taken for the Commonwealth at Mashpee, which is a town adjoining Falmouth approximately 40 miles up the cape 122 acres of land dedicated by the Commonwealth as a public beach. The Commonwealth paid $375,000 for it. We have a program of expending $1,550,000 for the development of that.

On the other side of the cape there is already established and in operation a State-owned beach known as Nauset Beach, which is supported by the Commonwealth, and operated during the summer season, and the Commonwealth also operates a beach at Harwich and at Salisbury. They are in the process of developing extensive beaches.

Now, it has been the history of the Commonwealth operations, particularly of the province lands that it has owned over 300 years, that it has not been operated for the public, but that the public has been denied the use of the title which is vested in the people. I am sure some of you that rode down Race Point Road yesterday in order to reach the airport, if you looked on each side of the road where there was road leading off the surfaced road, you would see a sign approximately 24 by 30 which marks the land that is known as the province lands and is owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the wording of that sign says no tenting, no camping, no boating, no use of the area that belongs to the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Now, it may well be that they don't have the finances to take care of the area, but is the position of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with respect to policing these areas any better than the position of the Federal Government represented by the National Park Service, which is crying to the Congress for money for personnel in order to support and maintain it, that they now have? I have seen some of the propaganda of the department in which they set forth reasons and justifications for getting money. They show pictures of their various national parks, they show them littered with beer cans, trash, and rubbish, but they represent those only for the purpose of indicating to the Congress that they are not being given sufficient funds to maintain the properties that they already own. It has been a maxim of the people in this area that if you can't take care of what you already own adequately, why add something else that you cannot adequately take care of for the purpose of letting it be despoiled?

Now, in that connection it may be well, at this particular time, in view of some of the written testimony that has been presented at previous hearings, to correct what I believe is a fallacy on the part of some of the professional planners and do-gooders who come from off of the cape who take the decided position that we people who, through our relatives, have been here for over 300 years, through the grace of God suddenly need a professional planner to come down and tell us how to safeguard this area.

In that connection, I will say that I have been a selectman, member of the board of assessors and member of the board of public welfare in my town for 22 years. We received up to this year, the munificent salary for those three offices of $700 a year. So that we are not working for the money. I know that people in political life, and we don't consider selectmen in our towns as being in political life, but I know they are not supposed to be too bright and I would say that anyone who allowed himself to be persuaded in office for over 22 years is probably a little more stupid than the rest.

However, I would like to point out that in my town when I became a selectman the tax rate then was $35.50 a thousand; 22 years later, the tax rate is $37 a thousand, an increase over a period of 22 years of $1.50. At that time, we had a debt, both funded and otherwise, of over a thousand dollars. At the present time, we have no debt in the town of Wellfleet; we have approximately between $250,000 and $300,000 in cash. During that period of time, we have built a new school; we have participated in the construction of a regional school; we have built a new town hall; we have built a new fire department; we have built a new highway department; we have built a new bathhouse, and we have acquired on Cape Cod Bay one-half a mile of beach frontage that is owned by the town of Wellfleet, available to the public without cost.

We have accumulated in various spots on Cape Cod Bay approximately 3 miles of beach front that is owned by the town of Wellfleet at no cost. We have built on Wellfleet Harbor, with the assistance of the State and Federal Governments, what I believe is conceded to be the finest marina in the New England States at a cost of approximalety $3 million. We have established a zoning code for the town; we have gradually strengthened it.

Up to 2 years ago, we were the only city or town in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that had a public landing on every great pond within the limits of the town. We have a public landing of 5¾ acres on Gull Pond. We have a public landing on Great Pond of over 2½ acres, with the frontage on the pond of over 1,200 feet.

I believe that someone in the town of Wellfleet has been doing a little thing—has been doing a little planning—and I dislike to think that we are as ignorant as we are allegedly depicted as being.

We are proposing to your honorable committee elimination of certain areas in the town of Wellfleet that we have arrived at after a number of hearings, a number of meetings. It is the unanimous consensus of the board of selectmen; it is the unanimous consensus of the town planning board; it is supported, notwithstanding statements that have appeared in your record, by the town generally and we have suggested elimination for certain definite and visible purposes.

I call your attention to the area around Gull Pond that is shown on your map. It is an area that at the present time is highly restricted; it is land that has been registered in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts under a special court proceeding; it is restricted so that it can't be developed with more than one house on any lot; and it requires utility and other services to be underground. There is a restriction in the deed which prevents removal of the topsoil. It is an area at the present time in which the property owners have petitioned the town not to put a town road in because they want to keep it in its natural state. It is an area that is presently well developed, highly restricted, and should be eliminated from the park.

On the same side of the highway, we also respectfully ask that the area shown on your map as Great Pond Village, which is a series of ponds, be restricted basically for the same reason.

In making these restrictions or suggestions for elimination, I respectfully call to your committee's attention that we have provided complete access to all of the ponds concerned so that they may be enjoyed by the persons who would use the park.

You will notice in the Gull Pond Village section that we have included within the park area all of the pond areas so that the general public could have access to them.

You will notice on the section shown as the Great Pond Village, that we have shown a line of the park as consistent with the southerly lip of Great Pond and that that particular location, the town of Wellfleet owns 1,200 feet along that road so that the park visitors and the general public would have access to that pond. We have done the same thing with respect to Long Pond, which is the pond on the north side of those series of ponds.

We have respectfully suggested that the area shown as Boundbrook Island on the Cape Cod Bay side be eliminated. That is an area that at the present time has approximately six houses on it. The landownership in that area is by persons having anywhere from 10 to 60 acres. It is the home of Judge Biddle, former Attorney General of the United States, who has certainly made his case plain to the committee.

The adjoining area to the south, which is shown as Griffin Island, is a parcel of land that has been subdivided into lots not less than 3 acres. The smallest lot that has been sold in that subdivision up to the present time is a land acreage of 5 acres. It is restricted to one house on a lot. The utilities must be underground. There can be no removal of the topsoil. These restrictions are contained in the deed and run with the land until 2060. So that there is no possibility of despoiling that particular area. There are presently eight houses built on there and of those eight houses, each one of them has 10 acres of land subject to the restrictions that I have mentioned.

I wish to call to the attention of the committee at this particular time that under the provisions of the so-called Kennedy-Saltonstall bill, and the companion House bill that originally there was a provision that 10 percent of the area included in the park be excluded, but it was the unanimous consensus of the opinion of the selectmen of the towns and of those primarily interested in planning that that provision would be a dangerous provision in the bill; that it would create great problems in the community about designating which area should be excluded; that it would not be fair to the park to have the potential of eliminating certain sections.

For that reason, at previous hearings, we strongly suggested that the 10 percent clause be eliminated and consistent with that, we have tried through compromise and suggestion by the areas that we request now to be eliminated, to arrive at the 10 percent. And I respectfully suggest that the total area that we now suggest be eliminated does not exceed the 10 percent which we would have had under the bill.

I further respectfully suggest that if these areas are eliminated notwithstanding the provision of the bill, the town of Wellfleet will donate to the Federal Government approximately 1 mile of the beach front it owns on the Atlantic Ocean side; not less than 3 acres on Beach Road; all of the public land acres we have on Great Pond which we propose to make available to the Park Service.

I respectfully suggest that, notwithstanding my longstanding opposition to the establishment of a park in this area, primarily because of the fact that I do not believe that this area is consistent with the long-established policies of a national park system, I believe that when these communities put the time and the effort—we have the representation that we have had through Congressman Keith—and arrived at what we believed was a reasonable solution, that that proposed solution should have some standing and that the evidence as submitted by my friend Mr. Foster—who on one hand says in his original testimony that the proposal for elimination of any area would be ridiculous, then on the question by one of the honorable members, he had no knowledge of what we proposed to eliminate or the justification for it.

I say if these people would have spent the time and the energy to find out why we are doing these things, instead of standing apart and throwing rocks as some of them have done, and as some of them will do. You will hear me today accused—there is a real estate operator. I will tell the board that every parcel of land that I own or that is in my family I have purposely included in the national park and I own on the ocean approximately 100 acres of land that I have included in the national park. I own on Gull Pond approximately 65 acres which I have included in the national park. I own on Gull Pond Road 18 acres which I have included in the national park. I do not own in my own right one single parcel of land that I am asking to have excluded from the national park. I am an attorney, I represent several banks, I, at one time, represented seven towns. I do business. I transfer or have a hand in transfer of at least 90 percent of the land sales in Wellfleet, and I resent the fact that a professional planner or otherwise, without the knowledge, states on public record that I and some of my associates are opposed to the national park only on the basis of personal interest. I think the facts discount that.

In connection with that, I specifically call to your attention correspondence that was sent directly to Representative Aspinall of which copies were sent to persons in the area, mentioning my name specifically and individually.

I would like to point out for the purpose of the committee that in each of the instances where it was said that I either own or represent as a broker any person or have any part in any subdivision that is shown on these letters, that they are entirely incorrect.

I would like to call to the attention of the board that certain statements were made with respect to your committee and members of the committee and with respect to Hastings Keith. Primarily that I become a coordinator for Hastings Keith. Incorrect. And I would like the committee to know that they are incorrect.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. [Applause.]

Mrs. PFOST. Our next witness is Mr. Snow of Provincetown.

STATEMENT OF JOHN C. SNOW, CHAIRMAN, SELECTMEN, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mr. SNOW. Madam Chairman and members of this honorable committee of Congress, my name is John C. Snow. I am chairman of selectmen of the town of Provincetown. Perhaps, I should state first of all that I am neither a professor nor a professional planner. I, too, am a lawyer by profession. I submitted a statement to this committee at the hearings in Washington on June 21, 1960, on behalf of the government of the town of Provincetown and I will stand on that statement.

The committee, I think, has shown great consideration to the people in the area involved by coming to the cape at this time of the year. When I originally suggested to the committee that they visit the cape, I had hoped that they would come at a time when the climate, that is the weather climate, would be much more favorable.

I would like to say that I am not a transient in the area either. As oldtimers in Provincetown and on the cape used to say when I was a boy here—and I was born here—whenever anyone asked them where they were born, they would say, "I was Cape Cod born and Cape Cod bred, and when I die I am going to be Cape Cod dead." That is about the way I feel. I have made my life, my future, my career here.

I think that it has been ably defined that a politician is one who looks to the next election while a stateman is one who looks to the next generation. We are looking to the next generation in our proposal.

The proposal concerning boundary revisions from the original bills and national park proposal which we have supported in the town of Provincetown is one which looks to the next generation.

In the case of other towns, a provision has been made for expansion and growth. The same provision, I think, should be made for the town of Provincetown and that is what we are asking for. Those of you members of the committee and others who made the tour by helicopter yesterday over the lower cape, I think, could not help but be impressed by the crowded nature of the town of Provincetown. The way it was worked out there the children growing up who build their homes as they grew up and got married would build their homes in the backyard of the ancestors, either the grandfather or the father.

After a while, we ran out of backyards, consequently we have had very little building because of the lack of room for expansion.

Provincetown is perhaps the only town on the cape, according to the last Federal census, that has lost population. The reason for that is obvious from the crowded nature of the existing lands within the town limits of Provincetown. When a young couple grows up today, fall in love, get married, there is no place to build there. If they are going to build homes they will build in one of the adjacent towns, Truro or Wellfleet, many of whom still work in the town of Provincetown and feel economically tied to the town. We need room in which to build.

Originally, Provincetown—and I think it is significant being here today—was a part of the precinct of Eastham and governed from Eastham as a part of the province lands. Now, the province lands, I have heard a lot of talk about it by some who know a lot about it and some who may know less.

Now, the province lands is sort of an anachronism. It is not a State park, it is not a town park, it is not yet naturally a Federal park. The province lands were originally established as lands about which they didn't know anything else to do. So they called it the province lands. Squatters went in there. In the area near the airport, where we were yesterday, at Race Point, there was a very lively settlement many years ago known as Helltown where the fishermen lived and where they had their shacks and where they kept their gear and where they went out fishing from. On Long Point extending into the harbor which is now part of the Federal reservation, part of the province lands, as well as on Long Point, that is where the town was first settled.

Then, because of erosion, the storms, the inclement weather, and the dangers, eventually the town was moved into the settled area of Provincetown. At that time, it was all province lands. Subsequently, the legislature, through various enactments, recognized the situation that had been created there. The town, I might say, was incorporated in 1727. It wasn't until about 1892, however, that the legislature clearly recognized the situation by putting up a permanent demarcation between the settled area of the town and the so-called less inhabited area and called it the province lands. It was all province lands at one time. Since then, even with the settled area of the town, in which we had a total area of about 8,230 acres that were taken from the town area—well, the province lands have an area of about 3,645 acres. The Federal Government holds lands in the Long Point area of approximately 230 acres. That would leave 2,350 acres within our corporate boundary. Then, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts came along again and took 310 acres of that for the construction of the Mid-Cape Highway and there are 1,165 acres which were originally proposed to be taken adjacent to the Truro line for the Pilgrim Spring State Park, for a part of it, and I understand that taking has never been consummated, but that is all land owned by taxpayers of the town of Provincetown today, of which we would be deprived if this legislation is enacted. That would leave about 880 acres in the town. Now, we have over 32 acres of cemetery and we have about 50 acres of streets and roads and that leaves us about 798 acres to live in, which would make us geographically certainly one of the smallest towns on the cape, if not in the country. That is why we implore you for your consideration.

The proposal which we have made is in the form of a bill which is pending now in the Massachusetts Legislature. We also have a study committee which has been established by the Massachusetts Legislature to look into this matter, and for the purpose of seeing what part of the land which has been taken by the Commonwealth should be returned to the town of Provincetown.

Now, I know that there are those here who may be opposed to this. We can expect it. I think in the last national election that was so close we know that everyone in this country does not think alike. There are some who feel one way, there are those who feel another way.

I am here, authorized by the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Provincetown, speaking for the town, gentlemen, in favor of this and asking for your consideration of the boundaries which we request.

Much thought has been given to this, much work has been put into it. I would like to see the land which would be returned to us by the Commonwealth, and, I hope, excluded from the national park, used for recreational and residential purposes within the town limits in order that our young people growing up may be able to buy individual lots there and may be able to live in the town in which they wish to live, the town in which they may have been born and in which they were raised.

Now, this, I think, is a reasonable request. This is a request which we make of you as a result, as I say, of much work, much study, much deliberation. All of the selectmen in the lower cape towns have gone over the various boundaries which have been proposed by the National Park Service and which we feel will be necessary in the towns for those of us who live here may be able to live with, and looking forward to the next generation, be able to survive as towns and communities.

We have spent much time with our Congressman, Mr. Keith, and with representatives of the offices of Senators Saltonstall and Kennedy on these matters. I think that we have worked out a plan with which we can live, a plan which will give the National Park Service a national park of which we may be proud. We are in favor of the national park, but with these modifications felt vital to the communities involved.

We must watch that in the creation of something we do not destroy something greater. Each of these towns has its own individual economy. We have in the town of Provincetown a town crier who goes through the streets crying out the news of the day, making certain announcements, and that is a tradition which has been carried on from colonial days. He is dressed in a pilgrim outfit.

Now, it would be fine, if here on the lower cape, all of those who may not otherwise be gainfully employed could dress in hip boots, walk up and down the streets in beards with a sou'wester and have a lobster pot slung over our shoulders or if we could be out in the dunes or be out in the bogs with berry scoops and look like characters and the rest of us dress in pilgrim suits. Unfortunately, the facts of life are otherwise.

Although we may be characters, in the broader sense of the word, we at the same time must protect the economy of our area. In the old days, we had people who lived in the dunes in the province lands;

we called them dune billies. We had those who lived in the lowlands; we called them bog billies. That is something like the hillbillies they have in some of the Southern States, but here they were called either dune billies or bog billies. Unfortunately, in these ways we can be neither. We must protect our economy; we must protect the future of the cape area. I think that the future—and I most sincerely believe this—the future of the area, the future of all of the other towns of the cape can best be protected as well as the national interest be asserted by taking not all of the lands which have been proposed, but a part of the land which will serve the purposes announced by the Park Service, and by the executive branch of the Government, a park that will be adequate, a park that will be ample, but a park which will not destroy the remainder of the cape.

We ask you, we implore you, to give us that consideration.

I thank you very much for this opportunity to appear before you. I thank you for the consideration you have shown us in coming to the cape, inspecting the area personally and giving those an opportunity, whether or not they agree with the remarks which I have made, giving them an opportunity to also appear conveniently in the area before this honorable committee of the Congress.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you, Mr. Snow.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon for any questions he wishes to ask any member of the panel.

Mr. Ullman. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I am going to make any questions I have very brief. I want to commend all of these selectmen for their very comprehensive statements and their very fluent arguments in defense of their position. I might ask you, Mr. McNeece—you were the first one to testify—are you all in general agreement on the proposals for the park and the exclusions?

Mr. McNeece. I would say from the meetings we have had it is the consensus that there will be a national park. I would say that the individual towns would prefer that they would be able to accomplish the objectives of the national park individually. I would say that it is probably beyond their financial ability to accomplish those objectives.

It has been my conclusion, after attending various meetings with the lower cape selectmen, that we feel that a national park can be established on the cape, provided the limitations, the eliminations which we consider are reasonable, are made, provided that the lower cape has assurance that as a result of the establishment of a national park the fringe area of this national park will not be under pressure for development for commercial purposes. In other words, we are concerned that if the national park is established with the eliminations we ask for, the balance of the lower cape continues to exist in its present charm, that the individual towns continue to maintain their present charm. It is hard for me to describe that charm except to say that it is something like a Currier and Ives picture, any one of the towns.

I would think, without polling the members of the committee, that that would be the opinion of the members of the lower cape.

Mr. Ullman. I would think there would be individual variations from that. Now, let me ask a more specific question. Have the various towns taken action in their town meetings? Have you passed resolutions pertaining to this proposal before us today? If so, which towns have passed resolutions through town meetings?

Mr. McNEECE. The town of Chatham has on two occasions put this to a vote, once at special meeting, at which time the vote was unanimously in favor of the position taken by the selectmen as shown in the brief which has been presented to this committee, that Morris Island be eliminated from the park proposal.

At the last annual town meeting, we asked for another expression of opinion and by a ratio of more than 45 to 1 the town again voted that Morris Island and Monomoy Island should be excluded from this proposal.

(COMMITTEE NOTE.—The following information was subsequently received from Mr. McNeece:)

Barnstable County Selectmen's Association asks to record the following towns as supporting the position taken by the selectmen of the lower cape towns included in the proposed park: Bourne, Sandwich, Falmouth, Yarmouth, Dennis, Harwich.

Those opposing the park in its entirety, Barnstable and Brewster, will present their own briefs.

Mr. ULLMAN. Might I ask the other selectmen in order? Mr Horton, have you taken an official position in town meetings?

Mr. HORTON. I believe it was in June of 1959 at a special town meeting following the sending out of a great many cards. I forget just what the percentage was, but there was something like 40 or 50 percent for the park, around 30 percent were against it in its natural state, in the way you had proposed it and 20 percent approximately didn't care. They didn't return a card. I might be wrong on those figures. They will be available if you wish.

Mr. ULLMAN. I wish you would submit them to the committee. Would you do that?

Mr. HORTON. I will do that. I have that information now. About 1,140 questionnaires were sent out and 680 were returned. Some 138 or 20 percent were in favor of the national park as laid out and 80 percent were against it. A vote was taken.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Hurd, has Eastham taken a position?

Mr. HURD. Yes, sir. Actually, not through a town meeting to which the inhabitants came and voted, however, our board of trade sent to every resident taxpayer as well as the nonresident taxpayer a copy of this bill and the Congressional Record when it was introduced into the Congress, to the taxpayers along with a questionnaire in which they answered the questions sought by our board of trade. From that two-thirds of each, both the resident and nonresident taxpayers, were in favor of a national park provided it did not take what was already well developed areas in the town, a smaller taking; approximately 17 percent favored the national park as proposed at that time in the bill that you are studying and having hearings on at this time; and the remaining which would be approximately 17 percent, were opposed to any park in any form.

It was surprising to us to find that both the resident taxpayers and the nonresident taxpayers statistically agreed. So the results of that poll, the questions asked before the Senate hearing, are supplied as part of our brief.

If you like, I will get out our copy of that so it can be submitted for the record on the House side.

Mr. ULLMAN. I would ask you to do that.

Mr. HURD. From that inquiry sent out the present position of the the board was founded and elaborated on.

Mr. ULLMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Frazier, what about Wellfleet?

Mr. FRAZIER. The town of Wellfleet has had no official vote on the matter. Between 70 and 75 percent of our property is owned by nonresident taxpayers, 25 percent by resident taxpayers. In a town the size of ours, which in the wintertime is 1,400 people and in the summertime swells up to 10,000 people, we have a fairly good idea among those 1,400 people how they believe. We have had no official action taken at a town meeting. There once was a time we could tell what anyone had for breakfast. We can't tell that any more, but we can tell pretty much without taking an official vote that the majority of the people are opposed to the park.

It would be of interest, we will be glad to include an official vote at the next annual town meeting February 11 of this coming year, a formal vote.

Mr. ULLMAN. Now, Mr. Snow, have you voted on the proposition at Provincetown?

Mr. SNOW. The town meeting has not taken an official vote on the proposition. However, the board of selectmen and the planning board have both held public hearings which were well advertised and as a result of the views expressed at the public hearings as well as our gage of public sentiment in the town, I would say a minimum of 90 percent of the population of the town of Provincetown, the voting population, would be in favor of the national park with the modification which we have proposed.

Mr. ULLMAN. One more question.

Mr. SNOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. ULLMAN. Why has the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts not provided you with more land for expansion? It seems to me you have made a rather good case. Why has not the State made the land available to you?

Mr. SNOW. I think the reason for that is that it has never been pressed. It hasn't been pressed until within the past year. I think the situation that we were in was pointed up and emphasized and made people aware of it when we were confronted with the national park legislation. And the Mid-Cape Highway went through Provincetown only about 3 years ago with a tremendous taking at that time which also has aggravated the need.

Mr. ULLMAN. It is your feeling then, that the park would bring people in and expand your town faster than it has expanded in the past and therefore, the need for additional land is accentuated because of the pending park proposal.

Mr. SNOW. We feel it would be vital because of that. We feel that being at the end of the line, so to speak, at the end of the cape, there is no place to go from there. Very often during the summer months, tourists who come to the cape will go to Provincetown to look for a place to stay and then start going into Truro and Wellfleet and Eastham, coming back in sort of a backlog manner. That is except for those who may have a specific destination of one of the other particular towns on the cape. They want to see the cape. They will come here and go right down to the end where the Pilgrims first landed and look around there and if they cannot find room there, then they will go into the other towns, come back up the cape. That problem would accentuate the need for additional land.

Mr. RIVERS. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. We mentioned earlier, Mr. Snow, that the province lands are under the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth.

Mr. SNOW. Yes, sir.

Mr. RIVERS. You plead that the park be limited and there be some exclusion to give your town a chance to meet the necessary expansion. Is that problem not basically now in the hands of the Commonwealth with the urgency that you people from Provincetown are placing upon it?

Mr. SNOW. At the present time, yes, sir, it is before the legislature.

However, we would like the Federal Government and the State both to give us that consideration and we would not like the land taken by the Federal Government before the State has an opportunity to act.

Mr. RIVERS. That is my understanding. I just want to make it clear that, as far as I am concerned, I am in favor of you folks having room for expansion consistent with the park. But I think you should press with your own State authorities to get an exclusion of the amount you think you need, or what would be generally considered a reasonable amount for expansion and that the Federal Government, of course, may lessen its pressure to take all of it.

Mr. SNOW. Yes.

Mr. ULLMAN. I would say to my colleague that this could possibly be included in the same legislation. I would certainly urge that Provincetown press its case strongly with the legislature.

That is all, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. PFOST. The gentleman from Alaska, do you have further questions?

Mr. RIVERS. I have no further questions.

Mrs. PFOST. Then the committee will stand in recess for lunch.

I believe this completes the questioning of the selectmen from the various towns.

(Whereupon, at 1:10 p.m., the subcommittee hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 3:15 p.m., the same day.)

AFTER RECESS

(The subcommittee reconvened at 3:15 p.m., the Honorable Gracie Pfost, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.)

Mrs. PFOST. The Subcommittee on Public Lands will resume its hearings. The first item on the agenda is to ask whether there is objection to including in the record of these hearings a brief for the exclusion of Morris Island from the national park, which has been submitted by Edward R. Noyes and Maude H. Noyes, trusteees of the Morris Island Trust, by their attorneys, Maguire, Roche & Leen. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

For the benefit of those who are here, the appendix and exhibits will all be placed in the file in view of the fact that pictures cannot be reproduced in the hearings. The statement itself will be incorporated in the hearings. Is there objection? Hearing none, then the statement will be included.

(Document referred to follows:)

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

(Submitted by Edward R. Noyes and Maude H. Noyes)

The owners of Morris Island wish to state that they are in favor of a Cape Cod National Park. Their position taken in this brief is that the inclusion of Morris Island does not serve the purposes of the national park. This also applies to Monomoy. It is interesting to note that neither Monomoy nor Morris Island was included in the initial proposal for the park as drawn by the Interior Department. It was only in the Kennedy-Saltonstall-Keith bill that the proposal was made to include Morris Island and Monomoy in the park.

BRIEF FOR THE EXCLUSION OF MORRIS ISLAND FROM THE NATIONAL PARK

QUESTION PRESENTED

The Kennedy-Saltonstall-Keith bill as presently drafted includes Morris Island in Chatham in the Cape Cod National Park. The question presented is whether Morris Island should be excluded from the national park.

I. CHATHAM, MORRIS ISLAND, AND MONOMOY LOCALE AND CHARACTERISTICS

The town of Chatham is located at the tip of the elbow of Cape Cod and is bounded on the three sides by water. To the north and east is Pleasant Bay, and to the south is Nantucket Sound. Its more than 30 miles of coastline is contrasted to the 5-mile town line between it and Harwich to the west. The fact of its isolated location has allowed Chatham to retain much of its 18th and 19th century charm. While today, Route 28, the local road through the towns on the south of the cape, runs through Chatham, the main U.S. highway, known as the Mid Cape Highway, and the county road from Barnstable to Provincetown both give Chatham a wide berth. (See exhibit 1.)

The most settled portion of the town is naturally that nearest to the water, and the most thickly settled is the area farthest to the east. This section of the town is known as the old village, and it retains many of the characteristics of the Cape Cod town of 150 years ago. The two roads through this section lead to Morris Island. Route 28 avoids this section to a great extent so that the roads which are inadequate by modern standards still manage to serve.

It is through this geographic accident and town planning that Chatham has been able to preserve its air of quiet dignity. So many of the Cape Cod towns have become only wide places on modern highways, with side roads to the nearest beach, that Chatham has long considered itself fortunate to be located somewhat out of the traveled way.

Located to the south of Chatham and connected to the town only by a manmade dike is Morris Island. This dike was built for the primary purpose of protecting Stage Harbor to the west—Chatham's only harbor of refuge—from filling up with sand. A secondary purpose of this dike was to connect Morris Island to the mainland so that houses might be built thereon. It is interesting to note that the town of Chatham made two previous efforts to join Morris Island to it in order that the island might be developed residentially. Both efforts, one a dike, and one a bridge, were washed out in subsequent storms as the town was unable to provide sufficient money to make the structures strong enough to resist the elements. The present dike was built with the combined funds of Chatham, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Federal Government.

Morris Island is divided into one part by the same name owned by Edward R. Noyes, comprising 149 acres of which approximately 56 acres are capable of being developed residentially. The other part known as Stage Island is owned by David M. Davis and comprises 55 acres of which 22 acres are capable of being developed into house lots. It is the intention of the owners to develop the 56 and 22 acres into a desirable residential community, while the rest of the acreage which is marshland the owners desire to leave in its present natural state.

Still further south from Chatham, beyond Morris Island, is Monomoy owned by the Department of the Interior and operated as a bird sanctuary. Monomoy is a narrow island not more than a half mile wide extending south approximately 10 miles into Nantucket Sound. It can be reached only after a short boat trip from Chatham. Exhibit 2 shows the water that separates Morris Island from Monomoy. The water in this cut is of great importance in the discussion of why Morris Island should be excluded from the national park.

The townspeople of Chatham have been alive to the fact that unchecked commercialism can destroy the cape for themselves and future generations. Thus, in 1957, the town adopted a zoning bylaw designed to check indiscriminate commercial and residential growth. Chatham's zoning bylaw, exhibit 3, is indeed a model of its kind and is specifically designed to maintain Chatham as the lovely, unspoiled town that it is. Business uses have been severely limited, and the entire coastline has been zoned for residence. The minimum lot size in the town has been set at 10,000 square feet, and by far the greatest portion of the shore has a minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet. Such zoning effectively precludes the shanty type of development which has done much to destroy the beauties of the cape towns and seashores.

Prior to the building of the dike, Chatham, on March 4, 1957, zoned Morris Island with minimum lots of 20,000 feet. The Noyes development, which will be discussed in detail later, provides in its restrictions that no lot shall be less than 1 acre. The Davis development provides for lots with a minimum size of 30,000 square feet (exhibits 4 and 5). In short, Chatham has already within its jurisdiction taken adequate steps to preserve its natural beauty. When Morris Island became available for development, the town promptly took action to be certain its development coincided with the town planning. The Noyes development by its own restrictions went the town more than one better. This development will enhance Chatham's natural beauty. Both Chatham and Mr. Noyes have anticipated the overall purpose of a Cape Cod National Park.

II. OWNERS OF MORRIS ISLAND

Morris Island is owned by Edward R. Noyes, Sr., and his wife, Maude H. Noyes, as they are trustees of the Morris Island trust.

Mr. Noyes, aged 63, lives in South Natick. He has been employed for 30 years by the United Shoe Machinery Corp., and is currently the manager of one of its operating departments. As a public spirited citizen, Mr. Noyes has been extremely active in the affairs of the town of Natick. A brief synopsis of his activities is as follows:

Town of Natick Finance Committee, 1929–49.
Chairman of Natick Finance Committee, 1935–49.
Served as vice president and president of the Massachusetts Association of Town Finance Committees.
Moderator of the town of Natick, 1951 to date.
Presently trustee of the Natick Five Cents Savings Bank.
Presently trustee of Bacon Free Library.
Presently trustee of Shaw Gymnasium.

Chatham has been and is a second home to Mr. Noyes where he is equally well known and active in local affairs. He has owned his own home there since 1925 where he spends his summers and as much time as possible in the winter. While a student at Dartmouth, he worked summers for fishermen in Chatham to help pay his way through school. After 2 years of service in the U.S. Army in World War I, he returned to graduate from the Amos Tuck School of Administration and Finance while continuing to find summer employment in Chatham.

As heretofore noted, a dike was built in 1957 connecting the town of Chatham with Morris Island. Upon completion of this dike, the town zoned Morris Island for single residential purposes. There was considerable apprehension in Chatham that Morris Island would not be properly developed. The town is justly proud of its zoning laws, and it was very important that Morris Island should be developed in accordance with these zoning laws, all to the end that the character of Chatham remain unchanged.

Aware of and sharing the town's concern about the proper development of Morris Island, Mr. Noyes bought this property on November 21, 1957. Immediately, on November 31, 1957, he hired Gordon Ainsworth Associates, experts in the development field, to draft a plan for the development of the island. Donald Durrell was the landscape architect who actually did the work on the project. His proposed plan is discussed in detail in the next section of this brief. Suffice it to say that his plans for Morris Island were selected for exhibition at the Brussels World Fair by the American Society of Civil Engineers as an outstanding example of subdivision design.

The development plans were submitted to the Chatham Planning Board on August 27, 1958, which promptly gave preliminary approval. Final approval was to be given upon the completion of certain road construction which Mr. Noyes started on October 1, 1958. The road construction work was stopped in March 1959 with the announcement that it was proposed to include Morris Island within the national park.

It is most important to note that up until the time of this announcement neither Mr. Noyes nor anyone else in the local area had any idea that the national park was to include Morris Island. An examination of the Cape Codder, the principal weekly newspaper serving this area (see exhibits 6 and 7), shows that the inclusion of Morris Island came as a complete surprise to everyone.

To best illustrate the completeness of Mr. Noyes' surprise is to relate the story of Mr. Durrell's visit with Dr. Conrad Wirth, Director of the Park Service in the Interior Department. Mr. Durell formerly worked with Dr. Wirth. In the summer of 1958, he visited Dr. Wirth in his Washington office and showed him his complete plans for the Morris Island development. Dr. Wirth complimented Durell on his work. It is obvious that at this time Dr. Wirth himself had no knowledge that Morris Island was to be included in the national park. else he would have so informed Durell.

There are two further points to be mentioned in connection with Mr. Noyes' ownership of Morris Island.

The first is that Mr. Noyes and his two sons, Edward, Jr., and Charles, have each set aside one of the lots on the proposed development on Morris Island on which they intend to build homes. Mr. Noyes on his retirement in 2 years intends to live in Chatham permanently.

The second point is that while the town of Chatham has adopted admirable zoning requirement for Morris Island and the rest of the town, Mr. Noyes and Mr. Davis will impose even more stringent restrictions on the buyers of any lots in the development. These restrictions are set forth in exhibits 8(a) and 8(b). Mr. Noyes, Mr. Davis, and the town fathers see eye to eye in preserving Chatham and Morris Island for future generations.

III. MORRIS ISLAND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Noyes hired Donald Durrell of Gordon E. Ainsworth & Associates to prepare plans for the development of Morris Island. The plans as completed are attached in exhibit 4 and are referred to as the Quitnesset development plans on Morris Island.

Mr. Noyes' instructions to Durell were to prepare plans for the development of Morris Island that not only would fit in with the character of Chatham, but would in fact enhance these characteristics which make Chatham the town that it is. Mr. Durell proceeded to go to work. His qualifications and experience are as follows:

Degrees: Bachelor of science, master of landscape architecture.

Experience: 25 years of professional experience, including 8 years of teaching landscape design at University of Kansas and University of Massachusetts.

Member: American Society of Landscape Architects.

Chairman: Falmouth Park Commission.

President: Cape Cod Park Commissioners Association.

In approaching the task of subdividing Morris Island, Mr. Durrell based the subdivision on the following policies:

(*a*) Subdivide the land so as to make the most of what God gave us.
(*b*) Make each lot large enough to insure privacy and special freedom.
(*c*) Locate each lot so as to include a first-class building site.

(*d*) Locate lots only after thorough study of topography on the grounds.

(*e*) Lay out each lot so that it is outstanding for some special reason, such as: Excellent view, beautiful terrain, excellent trees and forest, proximity to beach and salt water, beauty of ground shape and contour, elevation, orientation.

(*f*) Then lay out the road system so as to service each lot easily and adequately and make the road fit the topography, not vice versa.

This approach required careful and extensive topographic mapping in order to secure an accurate map of existing conditions. The development of design required familiarity with every square foot of the area, with its forest cover, its terrain, its views and with all of the numerous features which controlled layout. The Quitnesset or Morris Island design, therefore, is the result of a great deal of coordinated design and field study, with the drawings evolving only after field layout had been tried, changed, tried again many times, and finally staked and approved on the grounds. This approach is far different from the ordinary approach to subdivision design, where a paper layout is staked out into lots, without considering many of the features which are felt to be of primary importance.

These are plans which Mr. Noyes asked Mr. Durrell to develop to completely integrate Morris Island not only with Chatham, but also with the Monomoy wildlife sanctuary. Section 4 of the brief as it relates to Monomoy, and section 5 as it relates to the town of Chatham discuss how completely the Morris Island development blends with Chatham and Monomoy. The plans as developed by Mr. Noyes are the ideal solution to the demands of the town of Chatham with its unique characteristics and the demands of Monomoy, the bird sanctuary.

From a professional point of view, the development plans prepared by Mr. Durrell were selected and were exhibited at the Brussels World Fair in 1958 by the American Society of Civil Engineers as an outstanding example of subdivision design. All credit to Mr. Durrell as an extremely competent landscape architect. Even greater credit to Mr. Noyes who saw his position as owner of Morris Island to be not that of a land speculator, but that of a citizen of the town of Chatham who respects its unique values as he does the value of the national wildlife refuge on Monomoy.

IV. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF MORRIS ISLAND AS IT RELATES TO WILDLIFE REFUGE ON MONOMOY

The island of Monomoy became a national wildlife refuge in 1944. The primary purpose of this refuge is toward the development, rehabilitation and improvement of habitat for waterfowl. Monomoy is located in the direct course of the Atlantic flyway. See exhibit 9 for a more detailed discussion of the management of Monomoy.

It should be noted that while recreation in various forms is permitted on Monomoy, such use is subordinated to its primary purpose as a bird refuge.

It is also important to note that Monomoy is accessible to the public only by means of a boat.

The original Park Service proposal did not include Monomoy in the proposed park. The Kennedy-Saltonstall-Keith bill, however, does include Monomoy. The explanation of the bill, however, definitely states that it is the intent of the bill to "preserve the separate identity of the refuge and to have it administered for only such recreational purposes as will not interfere with its principal purpose as a wildlife refuge." (Remarks of Senator Saltonstall from the Congressional Record.)

Prior to 1954, the Government owned large sections of Morris Island. In September 1954, the U.S. Government Department of the Interior initiated action realining certain areas of Morris Island to be used for a wildlife refuge, taking southeasterly, southerly, and easterly parts and revesting 29 acres in private ownership through legal action taken in the U.S. district court. In short, in 1954 the Wildlife Service retained all of Morris Island needed in order to protect Monomoy as a wildlife refuge.

At present, the Department of the Interior has a right-of-way across Morris Island to the water which separates Morris Island from Monomoy. At the time of the revesting of the title to certain Morris Island land in private ownership, this right-of-way was provided for by Mr. Davis and it appears in Mr. Noyes' deed of purchase. Upon building a paved main road across Morris Island, Mr.

Noyes offered it to the town of Chatham as a public road. It will doubtless be accepted if Morris Island is excluded from the national park. It has been and still is Mr. Noyes' intention to offer to give to the Department of the Interior a right-of-way over this newly constructed road.

To sum up, the wildlife refuge already has all of the land of Morris Island that it needs. The situation was carefully examined in 1954 by the Wildlife Service and certain parts of Morris Island, unneeded, were actually turned back to private ownership. The Department now has a right-of-way, and Mr. Noyes has offered to give a better one. The development proposed can in no way interfere with the wildlife management. Most people going to Monomoy will go by boat from Chatham. It is probably only the Wildlife Service personnel who will use the road across Morris Island. It is submitted that Monomoy will in no way be affected by the Morris Island development.

V. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF MORRIS ISLAND AS IT RELATES TO THE TOWN OF CHATHAM

As is pointed out in the explanation of the Kennedy-Saltonstall-Keith bill, the primary purpose of the legislation is to preserve the way of life which has long been established on Cape Cod. It is submitted that the Morris Island development blends in perfectly with the character of Chatham as it exists today. Exhibit 10 is a series of snapshots which show some of the beautiful Chatham residences and also the narrow streets which lead into Morris Island. It is planned that the homes to be built on Morris Island will be equally beautiful.

Besides blending with Chatham, the Morris Island development will have a very beneficial effect on the economic life of the town. The present tax base is $22,085,750 with a 1959 tax rate of $32.90. The assessing policv is 60 percent to 70 percent of the cost or replacement value. The contemplated selling price in the Noyes and Stage Island development is at least $10,000 per acre. The restrictions on size of buildings assure that no houses will be built costing less than $25,000 above the ground. It should be borne in mind that the development will not be merely a summer colony, but for the most part will be substantial year-round homes. On these figures the development when completed will add approximately $1,500,000 to the tax base of the town and an annual income of $49,500 based on the present tax rate. Clearly, this increase in revenue is of great importance to the future of Chatham.

Equally important to the economic life of Chatham is the fact that practically all of the construction work in the development will be performed by local carpenters, plumbers, electricians, masons, and other skilled laborers. The employment that such building will provide in the off season is particularly important in a town such as Chatham. Upon completion, the development will continue to provide employment during the winter months in the maintenance and landscaping which will be required. There can be no doubt but that the Morris Island development will be a great boon to the economic life of Chatham. Thus, the Morris Island development not only blends with Chatham, but by its economic benefits to both the town and its residents, helps insure the preservation of the town as it is today.

VI. REASONS AGAINST INCLUSION OF MORRIS ISLAND IN THE NATIONAL PARK

A. Morris Island would serve no purpose within the national park

There are a number of reasons advanced in the explanation of the legislation for the inclusion of Morris Island in the national park. The reasons advanced will be set forth with a discussion as to why they are invalid.

One reason is that Morris Island includes "a rare coast white cedar bog." The writer of this memorandum has closely examined this white cedar swamp, finds it of no interest whatsoever and believes that 99 percent of the general public would agree with him. It is in fact a swamp full of brambles and what appear to the inexperienced eye to be dead trees. Mr. Noyes, however, viewed the matter differently. Knowing that the swamp was of interest to a very small minority, he offered to dedicate this area to the public use for 99 years. This offer was made to the selectmen of Chatham, and it is still Mr. Noyes' intention to so dedicate the swamp. It is most important to note that Mr. Noyes' offer to the selectmen long predated any thought that Morris Island might be included in the national park.

A second reason advanced for including Morris Island in the national park is that it is the means of access to Monomoy. As has been previously discussed, this in fact is not so. For the general public, the only way to get to Monomoy is by boat from Chatham. At low water, the passage can be navigated on foot but only by one thoroughly familiar with the area. The water separating the southern edge of Morris Island from Monomoy is pictured in exhibit 2. Obviously, anyone wanting to visit Monomoy would not go to Morris Island. For the purposes of the wildlife refuge and its administration, provision for a right-of-way across Morris Island has already been made. Further, Mr. Noyes is prepared to offer the Department an even more satisfactory right-of-way across the island. Therefore, as a means of access, there is no reason for including Morris Island in the park.

It is contemplated that Morris Island would be a tent or camping site. First, let it be noted that a tent or camping site would run contrary to Chatham's model zoning regulations. More to the point, however, is the geographic location of Morris Island in relation to the remainder of the contemplated national park. Please refer to exhibit 11 in reading the following description.

Chatham is at the elbow of the Cape. South of Chatham is Morris Island connected by a dike. South of Morris Island is Monomoy. Nauset Beach (or North Beach as it is referred to by the citizens of Chatham) runs northeasterly from Chatham; Morris Island and Nauset Beach are separated by an expanse of water of about three quarters of a mile. The water between is the outlet from Pleasant Bay into the ocean. It is a cold, swift running tide which makes even crossing from Morris Island dangerous in a small boat. A person coming to see the proposed national park and staying at the camping site on Morris Island would be approximately 15 miles from the nearest entrance to the national park at Nauset Beach. In short, the visitor enjoying a day in the national park would have to drive 15 miles to his tenting site on Morris Island. In the morning, he would have to retrace his steps over the same distance. The conclusion is that Morris Island has no logical connection with the rest of the park. Morris Island as far as the park is concerned is a complete dead end. There is no access either to Monomoy or to Nauset Beach except by a boat or a 30 mile round trip drive. Obviously, as a tenting and camping site, Morris Island does not fit into the plans for the national park.

The remaining reason advanced for including Morris Island in the park is the wildlife found thereon. It is suggested that what little wildlife there is can be seen in many other parts of the proposed park. Members of the small herd of deer that inhabit Monomoy occasionally swim across at low tide but always return to Monomoy. In short, there is no wildlife on Morris Island that could possibly justify its inclusion in the national park.

It has been suggested that at some time in the distant future Nauset Beach might join with Monomoy. There is no doubt that the southern extremity of Nauset Beach is continually being extended by the action of the tides. It is equally apparent, however, that if this connection ever does take place, it will be well south of Morris Island. Note on exhibit 2 how much further south of Morris Island Nauset Beach presently extends.

B. Adverse effect on Chatham

The economic effect on Chatham has already been discussed. First, there will be the loss of tax dollars and equally important will be the loss of employment to residents of the town, particularly during the winter season.

The inclusion of Morris Island in the national park will mean a great increase in traffic during the summer season. Chatham's streets are already overcrowded. The winter population of approximately 3,500 increases to 10,000 in the summer. This does not include the transients and guests of residents. The inclusion of Morris Island in the park will mean additional police patrols to handle the traffic. There will be more wear and tear on the main roads and arteries and this additional traffic will require more route and directional signs. The result will be that Chatham with its present unique charm will have thrust upon it thousands of visitors who will do little or nothing to help with the additional tax burden.

The most important effect of including Morris Island in the park is that it will inevitably cause a decline in real estate values. The homes as pictured in exhibit 10 are bound to depreciate in value with the increased traffic and possible road widenings. Such depreciation will start a spiral, resulting in an overall decline in property values in the town. Apart from the economic loss to the town government, the character of Chatham as it presently exists will definitely be changed. Chatham today fits in perfectly with the purposes of a national park. Nothing should be done to change this. Morris Island in the park will hurt Chatham and will be of no benefit to the park itself. Morris Island out of the park will be a source of strength in helping Chatham preserve its unique character.

CONCLUSION

This brief has divided itself into two sections: The first showing why the Morris Island development will help preserve for the future the basic character of Chatham. Chatham today is an unspoiled town. It is a part of the cape which the national park bill is seeking to preserve. The Morris Island development will enhance Chatham's character and economically help the town to maintain itself as it is today.

The inclusion of Morris Island in the park on the other hand makes no sense from the point of view of the national park. Morris Island for park purposes is a dead end and serves no useful purpose. The one or two reasons of merit advanced for its inclusion in the park, namely, right of access to Monomoy and preservation of the white-cedar bog swamp, have already been anticipated (long before there was any idea that Morris Island would be included in the park) and provided for by Mr. Noyes. On the contrary, its inclusion in the park will lead to the deterioration of Chatham. The economic loss of the Morris Island development, the traffic problems created leading to a decline in real estate values, all serve only to defeat the very purpose of the national park. Chatham must be maintained as is. Out of the park, Morris Island will do this, and, further, will be a source of strength for Chatham for the future. In the park, Morris Island can only be the cause of Chatham's decline.

It is respectfully submitted that Morris Island be excluded from the national park.

RICHARD MAGUIRE,
THOMAS J. CARENS,
Attorneys for Edward R. Noyes and Maude H. Noyes, Trustees of the Morris Island Trust.

Mrs. PFOST. Our first witness will be Joshua A. Nickerson. You may proceed, Mr. Nickerson.

STATEMENT OF JOSHUA A. NICKERSON, ORLEANS, MASS.

Mr. NICKERSON. Thank you, Madam Chairman. My name is Joshua A. Nickerson. I live in East Harwich, but my mailing address is Chatham. I am not a planning expert. I speak only as a private citizen, but I think perhaps I should qualify myself to some degree.

Half a mile from my home is where the first Nickerson who ever came from England to this country built his home about 300 years ago. Out of my kitchen window this morning, I could look at the land where William Bradford came from Plymouth to buy corn from the Monomoy Indians.

I became interested in this problem of conservation of the beaches many years ago, and I can demonstrate that by the fact that together with others, I personally have given to the town of Chatham nearly four miles of ocean front beach on Nauset Beach, which is the last four miles or so at the tip of Nauset now owned by the town of Chatham. Together with my neighbor adjoining my home, land directly in front of my home in East Harwich, I gave 200 feet for a local neighborhood bathing beach on Pleasant Bay.

More than 30 years ago, I saw the importance of the beaches in Orleans on the oceanside being preserved as they are and through a corporation of which I am president, I took steps to acquire title so that that beach could not be built upon.

Within the past few months, within the past year or so, the town of Orleans has taken that beach by eminent domain and it is now protected for all time against improper encroachment. I cite those examples not in the sense of trying to demonstrate that I am a particularly good citizen, but rather to demonstrate that this is a subject to which I have given a great deal of thought.

On the assumption that there is to be a Cape Cod National Seashore Park, we are immediately faced with two basic questions:

(1) What are to be its boundaries?

(2) What kind of park will it be?

The question of boundaries has already been discussed at length by others. I shall, therefore, devote this statement to the question of what kind of park or sheashore it might be. Here the basic question becomes: Shall it be primarily for conservation or shall it be primarily for recreation and amusement?

The National Park Service itself presents a confused picture as to its own wishes. Most of its publicity in favor of the park has painted a picture of conservation as the alternative to private exploitation.

On the other hand, the Department's bill itself, in its declaration of purposes, does not even mention conservation and the economic study made for the Park Service predicts that in 15 years there will be 10 million visitor days of transients staying for less than a week. This study emphasizes that the lower cape, outside the park itself, will become almost entirely commercial, catering to these transient visitors. If this development is encouraged, or even permitted, we will have saved the lower cape from private exploitation only to let it be destroyed by millions of casual visitors crowding every nook and cranny of this narrow land in the summer season.

The problem becomes, how can we have our cake and eat it, too. I believe this can be accomplished by writing into the bill provisions which will prevent uses of the park area, even by the Park Service itself, which will tend to be contrary to the purposes of conservation. Here are five specific suggestions to this end:

(1) The provision whereby the park would include the waters of ocean and bay for one-quarter mile offshore from mean low tide, should be stricken out. What possible purpose could there be for including these waters beyond low-water mark except to prohibit commercial fisheries, to construct commercial marinas, both which the Park Service has done in the Everglades National Park in Florida, or to control navigation, as would be the result in Chatham where the only entrance to the vast Pleasant Bay area is scarcely one-quarter mile wide. In any case, it should not be a function of the Park Service to control these navigable waters. Their domain should end at low-water mark.

Furthermore, between high- and low-water mark the Secretary of the Interior should not have anything to do with the control of the shell fisheries. The control should remain as it is now—in the towns—many of whose citizens depend upon shellfish for their income. This could be accomplished by excluding shellfishing instead of including it in section 9 of H.R. 9050.

(2) Commercial exploitation within the park, such as motels and barrooms, as has been done in the Everglades National Park and oth-

ers, should be permitted only with the prior assent of the town in which the commercial development would be located. The Park Service should not object to this restraint, since it is for precisely the purpose they say they wish to achieve—to save the land from destructive exploitation.

(3) Tenting should be permitted only on an extremely limited basis, and ultimately (when the visitor count runs into the millions), not at all.

Furthermore, the location and size of each tenting colony within the park should be subject to prior approval by the town in which it would be located.

It is interesting to note in passing that the number of tenting sites provided last year at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park was even less than the number at the Nickerson State Park in Brewster, here on Cape Cod. The Brewster sites are all taken for the summer each year early in January. So the pressure on the Cape Cod National Park for tent sites would run to many thousands. If unrestrained, it could destroy both the park and nearby real estate values as well.

(4) The dilemma posed under item 3 above can, however, readily be solved. This can be accomplished by establishing large numbers of tenting sites among the wooded hills and lakes between Plymouth and Cape Cod Canal. In that area there is already a State forest and a State beach for a starter, as well as many thousands of acres of private undeveloped forest land.

I might interject here for the information of the committee that I understand that the commissioner of conservation is not permitted under the Massachusetts statutes to have anything to do with ocean or tidal beaches. That comes under, I believe, the department of public works. Massachusetts has many curious divisions of that nature. But the commissioner of conservation is responsible for the 12,000 acres of Miles Standish State Park in this area I am referring to and, of course, many thousands of acres besides that, which is just open forest land at the present time. I think it is vital here to bear in mind that it is extremely narrow land with great problems not only locally, but on a mete basis for the whole Northeastern United States and that the concept of a contiguous national park comparable to the ones we have in the West and the South is quite inappropriate.

It seems to me that the Park Service itself has not fully recognized the significance of what seems to me to be a fact in that respect, and that the national-park concept should be that of a regional park made up of segments of which this would be the first.

I therefore suggest that provision should be made in the bill for the inclusion in the Cape Cod park, at a later date, of other noncontiguous land areas such as the Manomet Woods near Plymouth for tenting, or some of the Elizabeth Islands for conservation.

5. The advisory commission provided for in the Keith-Kennedy-Saltonstall—pardon me for putting Congressmen before Senators, but they are closer to us——

The advisory commission provided for in the Keith-Kennedy-Saltonstall bill is of utmost importance. The commission must, however, have some authority if it is to be either respected or useful. Its consent, as well as its advice, should be required in all matters involving any commercial or industrial development and any provisions for public overnight accommodations to be located within the park.

If and when the Park Service itself should feel that such developments would be desirable, the advisory commission, since its consent would be required, would, in fact, become most useful to the Park Service in obtaining the approval of the towns concerned.

The advisory commission would likewise be of great assistance as a liaison agency between the towns and the Park Service in developing good public relations between them in the years ahead. It should, therefore, not be subject to termination at the end of the arbitrary number of years, but should go on until such time as the Congress itself might, in the light of experience with it, by amendment to the act, determine what changes should be made.

In my summary, my appeal is that any Cape Cod National Seashore Park be primarily for conservation rather than primarily for amusement. To this end, I urge you to give to the towns the veto power over any exploitation of a contrary nature, by the Park Service itself, to deny to the Park Service control of navigable waters and shellfisheries; provide for tent colonies to accommodate in the future the millions of visitors in the Plymouth Woods where there is room enough for them instead of here where there is not; and give the advisory commission enough power to make it useful and respected. I urge you to prevent the ultimate exploitation of the park by anybody at all, and to preserve this narrow land in the name of conservation.

If we can have a Cape Cod national seashore dedicated to conservation, without opportunity for arbitrary use of powers by the Department of the Interior, and with boundaries acceptable to the towns within which it lies, then I am for it.

If the Congress will write such restraints and checks and balances into the act, the Park Service and the towns working together would then become the instruments together for the preservation for future generations of the heritage which we on Cape Cod have received from the past.

Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you, Mr. Nickerson. [Applause.]

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon for any questions.

Mr. Ullman. I just want to say, Madam Chairman, that I want to commend you, Mr. Nickerson, for doing some original thinking. I can see that all of the recommendations might not be feasible, but they are real food for thought, and I am sure that the points you bring home are going to be very well taken.

Mr. Nickerson. Thank you.

Mrs. Pfost. The gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. Chenoweth. I see you are a very public-spirited citizen, and you are to be congratulated for your interest in a very important matter. Do you feel that the park, if it is created—and there is a serious question as to whether it should be or not—should be for conservation rather than recreation? Of course, national parks are created for the enjoyment of the people and the National Park Service urges and encourages visitors to go to these national parks. That is why they are created for the benefit and use of our people. In other words, you do not propose that any such park as that be established here. You want to conserve these historic values in this area.

Mr. NICKERSON. I want to conserve the historic values and I do not want too many millions of feet to destroy the things the Park Service says they want kept.

I have here, to answer your question perhaps a little more fully, excerpts from the economic study which was made for the Park Service, and which is not available to the public, but was reported in the local daily paper some time ago. It says in this study that 15 years after the establishment of the park, they estimate 10 million visitor-days. We know that the visitor-days are going to fall within a short summer period, they are not going to be here in this kind of weather, unless they have reason to be.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Only Congressmen come in this kind of weather.

Mr. NICKERSON. Only Congressmen and Cape Codders. That means roughly speaking in my estimation assuming 5 days as average days, 2 million people in the course of a season. Let us assume that the economic study made for the Park Service is 100 percent overstated, not 2 million but 1 million people are going to visit here. Out of that 1 million people, how many are going to want to live in tents, for example? Just take that one aspect. Would you guess 200,000 or 400,000? I do not know. But we now have in the Nickerson State Park, full use, according to the Commissioner, of its area for park purposes. That is a densely wooded area where you can have your tents and not be seen, which would be impossible in most of the park area.

Based on that experience, they are accommodating 2,000 people at one time, let us say, or 12,000 per year and they are sold out the first week in January.

Mr. CHENOWETH. So I understand.

Mr. NICKERSON. Now, if that is the case, how many people would want to live in tents within the national park if they are made available and certainly in this democratic country you couldn't say you can come, but you cannot. You would have to make it available for a reasonable number. How many would want to come? My guess is somewhere between 200,000 and 400,000.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think 400,000 would be closer to it.

Mr. NICKERSON. I was trying to be conservative. Four hundred thousand people in the summer season living in tents in this Cape beach area. What is it going to do to us?

Mr. CHENOWETH. It is going to change your whole economy.

Mr. NICKERSON. It is going to destroy the whole picture we are trying to preserve. These people can be accommodated not just in Plymouth, but if the Park Service would raise its sights and envision this as a regional program, call it the old colony concept, or something of that sort, which embraces the original old colony, which went over to Narragansett and think of the whole area of the southern Massachusetts and Rhode Island as one concept, they could accomplish these things, but they cannot do, in my opinion, what they have done in the past, what they are experienced with.

Their thinking, if I may be permitted to criticize, has been based upon their own experience and not on the facts of life as we see them here.

Mr. Chenoweth. I assume from what you say you would be opposed to establishment of the park for recreational purposes?

Mr. Nickerson. It seems to me if that were done, it would destroy it for every other purpose.

Mr. Chenoweth. You would be opposed to legislation which would do that?

Mr. Nickerson. Definitely, yes. Recreation must be included, of course, but not the type which would destroy it.

Mr. Chenoweth. You also mentioned the desirability of cooperation between the National Park Service and the towns.

Mr. Nickerson. I think this is absolutely essential.

Mr. Chenoweth. I think that would be wishful thinking, Mr. Nickerson, because I do not think that is going to be done. I think if the national seashore park is created, then the National Park Service will have full control and jurisdiction and will make the decisions.

Mr. Nickerson. In that case then, it becomes doubly important that the area to be used for a park service and the restrictions as to how it may be used be written into the thing by the Congress because if the Park Service is given carte blanche to do as it wishes, their philosophy is like the original Neuberger bill, which called for the Secretary of the Interior to have absolute choice of any three areas in the United States at his discretion and do whatever he chose with it, without regard to anybody else. That represents the background of their philosophy.

Mr. Chenoweth. I have been in Washington for some years and have a very high regard for the National Park Service. Dr. Wirth, their Director, is one of my very best friends, but I have observed during these years that the Government agencies do not always follow the wishes of Congress. I do not want to mislead you in this situation, but I want to warn you to be alert to the fact that if you turn this over to the National Park Service, they will make the final decision and you will have very little to say about it.

Mr. Nickerson. That is why, Mr. Congressman, I think it is absolutely essential that these checks and balances and safeguards should be written in by the Congress itself, because the executive department will not permit such things unless Congress causes them to be written in.

Mr. Chenoweth. I am not sure we can write in all of the safeguards you want that will give you the protection you are seeking. I have some serious doubt of that, Mr. Nickerson.

Mr. Nickerson. It seems to me if the "Great White Father" has complete authority over this land, we can expect the way of life we have known to disappear in a way perhaps remotely comparable to what has happened in other activities where the "Great White Father" had such control.

Mr. Chenoweth. That is all. Thank you, Mr. Nickerson.

Mrs. Pfost. Mr. Rivers?

Mr. Rivers. Under your concept of emphasizing conservation, what access and use would the public have? Would people get to walk through these woods or what?

Mr. Nickerson. It isn't the woods.

Mr. Rivers. Or walk on the beach then?

Mr. NICKERSON. I would assume—let us take a place like Nauset Beach, extending from Orleans to Chatham. I would suspect there would be complete access there by both vehicle and by boat, but limited as to exact routes which the vehicles could follow in order to protect vegetation.

Mr. RIVERS. Let us say authorized ingress and egress.

Mr. NICKERSON. And boating and picnicking, and that sort of thing, but not uses which will tend to destroy the topographical features.

Mr. RIVERS. Then you are not trying to deny the public all access in the interest of conservation?

Mr. NICKERSON. Absolutely quite the contrary. I think public access is essential, but I think that the commercial and industrial and overnight accommodation type of exploitation, I do not think the Park Service should be allowed to establish barrooms in the national park without the consent of the towns. They have done that in the Everglades and that is all right as far as I am concerned, but it is not good on Cape Cod.

Mrs. PFOST. Are there other questions?

Thank you very much, Mr. Nickerson.

Our next group of witnesses will be Anthony W. Smith, National Parks Association; James E. Murphy, vice president, Massachusetts State Labor Council AFL–CIO; Norman Cook, executive secretary, Cape Cod Chamber of Commerce; Dr. George W. Shattuck, Massachusetts Nature Association; Van Ness Bates, Massachusetts Improvement Association; and Allen Morgan, representing the Audubon Society of the State of Massachusetts.

Is Mr. Anthony Smith here in the audience? He apparently has not arrived.

Norman Cook. Will you proceed?

STATEMENT OF NORMAN COOK, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, CAPE COD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, HYANNIS, MASS.

Mr. COOK. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, I am Norman Cook, executive secretary of the Cape Cod Chamber of Commerce and live in Barnstable. We filed a brief with your committee last year in Washington. We have sent copies of a revised brief which your staff has now before them.

We believe with our organization which has studied this problem for many years—that this is the one of conservation and land use—that before real action is taken by the Congress some other facts and information should be obtained; one that we hoped would be obtained by your committee and I think that we had requested some help and no doubt you have it before you. One request we made to you through our Congressman Keith was that the committee might make an economic study of this situation so that you might have firsthand facts. We were somewhat disappointed that our request was finally granted, but by the National Park Service, and it is a little like one organization acting as the judge and jury. We felt and we still believe a great deal of study must be given to this problem before the Congress can act in good conscience. You have heard Mr. Nickerson and several of our selectmen dwell on some of these points, so we will not plow through that ground again.

In our brief, we mention boundary revision, zoning regulation, the composition and authority of the advisory committee, tent sites and their numbers—and I think you have heard quite a little about that—payment in lieu of taxes, public health protection.

We are particularly concerned with traffic control. Mr. Nickerson just referred to the economic study report and brought to your attention the predictions of the amount of traffic this park would attract. Undoubtedly, in the last several days, you drove perhaps from Boston to this area. You perhaps weren't conscious of the highway between West Barnstable in the vicinity of Hyannis and the road here to Orleans and into Eastham, but it was a two-lane highway, limited access in nature, and we have found already, although that road has only been in operation 3 or 4 years, that particularly in July and August it is overcrowded. There were head-on automobile collisions with several fatalities.

One of the points that concerns us in this matter is this: If the prediction that is made by the people who made the economic study is anywhere correct, what is going to be the traffic situation? If we are to have these 10 million visitor days within a short time, how is this traffic to be accommodated? We believe that if this report is correct, we would hope that you might find some way to write into this bill a provision whereby the Federal Government would double-barrel the highway from West Barnstable to Orleans.

You are perhaps unaware of the fact that in this area we don't enjoy the 90–10 provision of the Federal Highway Act. We are still on the 50–50 basis. It seems to us if we are to contribute 30,000 acres of land for the national use, we shouldn't in turn be required to make the great expenditure that will be necessary to get the people that is anticipated in this report in here and out of here. We have a dangerous highway situation already. If the traffic here is to be tripled, in a short length of time, who is to handle the highway situation? That is a point you will give serious consideration to.

The payment in lieu of taxes, I think, has been pretty well covered by some of our selectmen. Also, the matter of advisory committee. As it now stands, it is proposed that this committee would be out of business in the matter of 10 years. We can hardly think that is wise for us or for the National Park Service.

The subject of the tent sites, of course, is the big issue, I think, here in this respect. If you have had an opportunity to read the National Park Service report, the first one they published in some length, it is a matter of 75 pages in this report or more, 92 pages, 75 of which are devoted to a report on biology, geology, history, and archeology. There is no doubt that these reports are factual and correct. If that is true, we have an unusual situation here that should be protected for posterity and we are heartily in accord with that. But then when we lay down that report, and pick up this one here that tells about 10 million visitor-days, frankly, we are puzzled. If we are not going to have lots of tent sites in this area, what is going to bring these 10 millions visitor-days to the area?

As far as we know, all the biological features, geological and so forth have existed for millions of years, perhaps. We in our office service something in excess of a hundred thousand inquiries every year regarding vacations on Cape Cod. I have been closely connected with the organization for 13 years. It is my memory, we have had about five inquiries over that period for the so-called stunted forest, an area down here where the wind and sand have caused certain conditions that stunt the growth of the trees. It is hard for me to believe that because we take this land from the State or from private ownership and place it it in Federal ownership, that because it has a taking now as a national park, we will suddenly have 10 million visitor-days unless there is some other attraction added to the natural features that already exist.

If we have large numbers of people that want to take vacations and are keenly interested in biology, geology, history and archeology, they would have come before. We would have had lots of inquiries about those things. I am not in any way disparaging people who have those interests and we welcome them to the area, but it is pretty hard for me to believe that we could have anywhere near 10 million visitor-days down here, unless we added something and the only thing I can conceive we can add are free tent sites, or tent sites at a very nominal charge, which would provide a reason for these people showing sudden interest in this area, which they have not evinced until now.

As I think Mr. Nickerson pointed out, if we do open this area up to hoards of tent sites then we stand a great chance of destroying the biology, geology, history, and archeology of the area. It just doesn't seem to make sense that we are going to have this thing both ways. It is practically impossible. There are points made in the economic report of the great value of the national park to the area as in the case of Hatteras.

Since the hearing in Washington, the census figures have been published and it is very curious to note that the area from which Hatteras was created, Dare County, N.C., is almost equal in size to Cape Cod. In other words, 388 square miles in Dare County and 396 square miles in Barnstable County.

In 1950 Dare County had a population of 14 people per square mile. Cape Cod had 114 people per square mile. Ten years have passed. They have had a national park there. Glowing reports and predictions are made of the great economic advantages enjoyed by the people in the vicinity of the Hatteras Park.

Now, we have the 1960 census. The population in Dare County has increased to 15 people per square mile. The population in Barnstable County has increased 50 percent and now is at 175 people per square mile.

If these national parks and particularly this seashore park is of such a great benefit economically to the area immediately concerned, it certainly isn't reflected in the population figures. There is quite a little other information along those lines from an economic standpoint contained in our brief which the staff has.

It all seems to point to the fact that a good many of these conclusions of the benefits to be derived from a national park to the people most intimately concerned with their livelihood is a lot of blue sky thinking. It just doesn't seem to happen.

Undoubtedly, you have had a chance to look at our land and our towns from the air. I do not know how closely you may have had the same opportunity in the matter of Hatteras. But I think you will agree there is a considerable difference between Barnstable County in Massachusetts and Dare County in North Carolina. They are two entirely different types of organizations. We are much closer to the center of the population. We are much more highly developed and to take the 30,000 acres from our land makes a much greater impact than it does to take it in a sparsely populated area.

I was interested in the comments of our commissioner of natural resources, or his remarks concerning the land areas now under the control of his department. I have before me a proposal from the division, one of the divisions in his department, that calls for the taking for conservation purposes of 30,000 acres of Cape Cod land but distributed throughout the Cape on the basis of conservation, not concentrated in one area. I was somewhat surprised to realize that perhaps Mr. Foster didn't know about this. This is in his own department, in the Division of Fisheries and Game. This is their thinking on how Cape Cod land could best be preserved. Curiously enough, it happens to be about the same number of acres, but certainly the impact won't be concentrated in one closely settled area.

One other point that strikes me as rather curious. In the hearings that were held in Washington last year, included in the report is an estimate of the cost of operation of this park by the National Park Service, and as I understand it, the area they have in mind acquiring is 30 miles of waterfront, so-called beach, their estimate is that in the 5th year in the operation of this park, they will only require five lifeguards for swimming in this area. That seems to me highly unrealistic. Most of our towns, in fact all of our towns here on the Cape operate beaches and we have requirements for lifeguards in greater numbers than that in beaches that are not 100 yards in length, let alone 30 miles. But, if that is the kind of thinking that the taking of this land and the establishment of the park is predicated upon, a much closer examination is required by someone, I would think, before your committee makes a report on this matter.

We hope that you can find the time to give this considerable study before you will make your final report. We certainly would like to have that opportunity of going into this in as much detail as possible.

We have before our State legislature a proposition supported by our planning board and selectmen requesting permission to appropriate money for that purpose and we hope you might delay your decision in this matter until we can have that information.

Thank you very much.

(Mr. Cook's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF NORMAN H. COOK, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, CAPE COD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. Chairman and committee members, on April 13, 1960, at the annual directors' meeting of the Cape Cod Chamber of Commerce it was voted to request that action on S. 2636 and H.R. 9050, proposals for a "National Seashore on Cape Cod," be postponed until our county government could be authorized to determine the economic impact of this proposal.

On November 1, 1960, our directors reaffirmed this position and added to the previous motion seven items that in their judgment need clarification and action before the Congress can act in good consciences on the proposed national seashore on Cape Cod.

Quoted below is this motion which was adopted unanimously 18 to 0 by the directors present:

"That our Senators and Congressman be advised of our keen interest in obtaining information concerning the economic impact on our county if the proposed national seashore is created on Cape Cod, and that they be further advised that time is required to obtain this information, because our general court has not yet acted on legislation sponsored by our county commissioners, selectmen's association and planning boards association, which will authorize a study to provide information needed locally to deal with the many changes that will result should the 'seashore' be created.

"Points needing clarification are: (1) boundary revision; (2) zoning regulations; (3) the composition and authority of the advisory committee; (4) tent sites, their number and location; (5) payments in lieu of taxes; (6) public health protection, easements for future water supplies, sewerage and garbage disposal; (7) highway expansion, traffic controls, and public safety costs."

We are told that this is the first time a national park has been proposed in a developed area. A comparison can be made between Cape Hatteras and Cape Cod in this respect.

The 1960 census shows that Cape Hatteras has a poulation of 15 people per square mile—Cape Cod has a population of 175 people per square mile. The similarity is evident also in the total land area—Dare County, N.C., 388 square miles—Barnstable County, 399 square miles. It may be appropriate to observe that since 1950 Dare County, N.C., has had a population increase of 561 people—Cape Cod's increase has been 24,207—a 50-percent increase compared to the Hatteras area of 10 percent. We can wonder at the glowing terms used in the Economic Development Associates report concerning the benefits of a national seashore.

We think you will agree that our concern is legitimate; the taking of nearly 30,000 acres of our land could adversely affect the economic growth and future of our county. This is not a wilderness area, but a rural, seaside, closely knit community depending on the use of our land as a resort area for our economy.

In addition to this we have been advised through the newspapers that our Senators will offer at these hearings perfecting amendments. As we have not been told what these amendments are, we, of course, cannot comment upon them, having not had an opportunity to consider their content or their possible effect upon our future.

We think the committee should also consider the rumor that even though the Congress fails to appropriate funds for the creation of this park, existing conditions may make it possible for this park to be created, if Congress simply authorizes it. As we understand the provisions of this proposal (see sec. 3A), the park may be created as soon as the Park Service can obtain the rights to 6,000 acres. Considering that a good portion of the land under discussion is already in public ownership, it may be possible for the Park Service to acquire the titles to this land and, therefore, without an appropriation, create a park.

I thank you for this opportunity to present our views on this matter.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Dr. George Shattuck.

STATEMENT OF DR. GEORGE SHATTUCK, MASSACHUSETTS REPRESENTATIVE, NATURE CONSERVANCY, BROOKLINE, MASS.

Dr. Shattuck. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, my name is George C. Shattuck. I live at 450 Warren Street, Brookline, Mass. I represent, at this time, Nature Conservancy, Inc., the main office of which is in Washington.

Nature Conservancy has chapters in many of our States and representatives in certain other States. I represent Nature Conservancy in Massachusetts. I am authorized to speak at this time for the board of governors, and I will read a statement which incorporates their thinking.

Nature Conservancy is a national organization. It has chapters in many States and representatives in others. I am the Massachusetts representative of Nature Conservancy. I am also a member of the board of governors. The primary purpose of Nature Conservancy is to promote the preservation of so-called natural areas for the benefit and the enjoyment of the public and for scientific study as well.

The board of governors of Nature Conservancy has endorsed the proposal of Senators Saltonstall and Kennedy to establish a national seashore park on Cape Cod. Years have passed, gentlemen, since Senators Saltonstall and Kennedy introduced their bill to establish such a park.

Pertinent questions have been discussed again and again at hearings in Washington and last December in Eastham where we are now. Objections have received consideration and important concessions to local interests have already been made.

To make further territorial concessions would be to restrict the scope of the project and seriously diminish its value to the State and Nation. Local interests should not override the paramount and enduring interests of State and Nation.

Moreover, local interest can change quickly. Zoning by local authority lacks the quality of permanence. Therefore, it cannot be relied upon to protect the broad and continuing interests of a wider public.

I have known Cape Cod for more than 60 years. Change at first was almost imperceptible, but today, the charm of the cape is disappearing fast. Unless the proposed national seashore park is established soon, little worth saving may remain. The necessary legislation should be given priority. Much valuable time has been lost already.

Speaking for myself as a citizen, I would say the charm of the cape has been in my blood for a great many years, although I own no land down here and have not spent as much time here as I would wish. But I see such change and with such rapidity now that I want once more to stress the urgency of taking action if we are to save the charm of the outer cape.

I know that Mr. Nickerson's talk had a great many important points to which I wholeheartedly agree. Among them was the point that tenting within the park, unless very restricted, would be undesirable and make it difficult to retain the natural features and natural beauty which are the main objectives to be attained. There is plenty of room in the cape for tents if they are kept away from the national park.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you, Dr. Shattuck.

Our next witness is Van Ness Bates.

STATEMENT OF VAN NESS BATES, MASSACHUSETTS IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. Bates. Madam Chairman, my name is Van Ness Bates. I am managing director of Van Ness Bates Associates, Planning and Research Consultants, of Boston, Mass.; and also executive vice president of the Massachusetts Improvement Association organized in 1935 to promote the welfare of the Commonwealth.

My associates have prepared, and the Massachusetts Improvements Association has sponsored for presentation, an extensive study and report entitled, "The Cape and the Park." This report runs over 100 pages and is composed of foreword, preface, five parts, and three map exhibits. It has taken the best part of 4 months' work to compile. Some 350 copies have been made ready and distributed to the congressional Subcommittees on Public Lands, to the National Park Service, to all the Cape Cod towns and to selected other authorities, organizations, and individuals. You, Madam Chairman, and your fellow committee members have copies of "The Cape and the Park," and can judge for yourselves as to the merits of what our report contains.

On this point, we wish it distinctly understood that, as we said in our letter of transmittal to the Massachusetts Improvement Association, any endorsement of any part of our report is solely up to the recipients—not up to the Association, which has done its full civic duty in sponsoring this report for presentation and consideration. In turn, the Van Ness Bates Associates assume all responsibility for the statements and suggestions made in "The Cape and the Park" report.

I should like to state there, Madam Chairman, that the report is solely suggestion. It is not an official report. It is professional but not official; therefore, it does not contain recommendations. It contains suggestions for the consideration of Congress, Cape Codders, and others.

Now, Madam Chairman, when I was officially engaged in Provincetown last spring to render a preliminary survey report, prefatory to a future master plan, and which was so rendered in July, I became convinced that the drastic differences in points of view between the National Park Service, on one hand, and the six lower cape towns directly concerned, on the other, were an open invitation for an independent study to see if a plan could be devised both adequate for the Government and acceptable to the towns.

That is the crux of this whole problem, to find something that will be adequate for the Government and acceptable to the towns, and we must find the answer.

Others agreed that the effort should be made and needed to be made; private funds were made available, and this extremely exacting and arduous task has been completed because there are those of us who were convinced that such an independent study and report, offering a third alternative to that of the National Park Service and to whatever plan the six-town committee might produce—if, indeed, they could agree on any specific plan—should be made available for the consideration of your committee and others.

At this point, Madam Chairman, I wish to stress the importance of having alternatives to consider and to quote the eminent British military author, Capt. B. H. Liddell Hart, as follows:

> Alternative techniques teach each other. The existence and development of alternative courses always carries the best promise of attaining the object in any field.

Furthermore, and with all respect to the National Park Service, with whom I conferred last summer and again the first week in November, I wish to stress that I believe our report, "The Cape and the Park," is the only study to date that, to any substantial extent, not only proposes specific boundaries for a Cape Cod Park, but also analyzes the vital aspect of access, without which usage cannot possibly be determined. Our report also analyzes supplementation by other possible park segments in the Cape Cod and related regional area so as to (1) justify the modification of the Cape Cod National Park we propose; (2) diversify the impending regional visitor load which would tend to overwhelm instead of benefit the cape if it were to be concentrated entirely on the so far officially proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park project alone.

Madam Chairman, it has been my privilege and pleasure to have made studies of the northeastern Atlantic seaboard, particularly southeastern New England, and Long Island, since 1924 when I first proposed the Narrows Bridge at New York, now under construction; and the possibility of connecting Long Island with Connecticut and Rhode Island from Orient Point, Long Island, via Plum, Gull, and Fishers Islands, a vast project now under serious consideration.

In this present study and report entitled "The Cape and the Park," we have endeavored to paint a regional picture in which the Cape Park is the central theme but not the only theme. About two-thirds of our report deals directly with the Cape Park. But there is a middle ground and a background as well, and they must be evaluated, in our opinion, in making a sound, finalized decision in regard to the Cape Park.

Particularly do we believe and stress that the time has clearly come when provision should be made by national legislation for the acquisition and control of still available, sizable open areas by combined Federal-State financing and supervision, or, in other words, a special system of regional parks within the national park overall system.

Now, whether the Cape Park should be so designated and included, we do not presume to say, one way or another, at the present time, but we do suggest that this vital aspect be most carefully considered by your committee before you make your final recommendations to Congress. As to legislation for the Cape Park itself, we have, in part 5 of our report, made a tentative draft of what we feel might be the basis of a satisfactory revised and modified bill, that your committee, the incoming administration and the new Secretary of the Interior would probably find there is a field of research and study that is pressingly necessary in regard to working out a new technique by which we may have a park for a park system intermediary between true national parks and merely State parks. Just as in urban renewal, the Government pays two-thirds and the city one-third of the cost of developing land, so I venture to suggest that may be the solution to have the Federal Government pay two-thirds and the State one-third of these large-sized areas that are still available, and then to have the control and supervision by a commission of three ex-officio, one of whom would be the Regional Director of the National Park Service, the second would be the commissioner of conservation of natural resources of the State and the third to represent the people in the area involved would be the chairman of the county commissioners. Something like that. There is a vast field for exploration here and it is right up the alley of everybody concerned, I think, with the new administration, and the Interior Department and so forth, this whole theory of regional parks. There must be some way in which we can get the still available reasonable sized areas, especially in densely populated regions where the denser the population is the more an open area must be found to serve people with some measure of recreational as well as conservation.

Recreation in other words consistent with conservation.

In conclusion, Madam Chairman, we wish to submit two specially prepared and annotated maps for the study and consideration of your committee. These are: (1) U.S. coastal chart 1208; and (2) a composite of the lower cape geodetic quadrangle sheets, which have been pinned up on the rear wall there. On the latter are clearly indicated: (1) our proposed approximate boundaries for a modified park; (2) the tax-vital upland areas we would delete in Provincetown, Truro, Wellfleet, and Eastham, so that these towns may have an economic future; and (3) the small coastal and island areas we would add in Truro, Orleans, and Chatham, items in Pleasant Bay and Corn Hill which is both historic and very scenic, we think. At least part of it might be included in this modified park.

As our study and report entitled, "The Cape and the Park," while professional, is not official, we would not expect it could be reproduced in whole in any transcript of these proceedings—as was the report of the Economic Development Associates, made for the National Park Service, in the Senate transcript of June 1960. We shall be glad, instead, to make our text and maps available, insofar as possible, and we have a number of copies of reports for those who are seeking or wish to have a copy, to all who would like to study them; and we would, of course, cooperate with any newspaper or periodical that might care to reproduce our report in whole or in approved part.

If I can be of any personal assistance to your committee, Madam Chairman, either on the cape or in Washington, my time and services will be made available to you. Meanwhile, I should be pleased to answer any questions that may be asked, and I take this opportunity to thank both you and the committee for your courtesy in permitting me to make this statement.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you, Mr. Bates.

Our last witness with this group is Mr. Allen Morgan of the Audubon Society. Mr. Morgan?

STATEMENT OF ALLEN MORGAN, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, AUDUBON SOCIETY, WAYLAND, MASS.

Mr. Morgan. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Allen H. Morgan. I live in Wayland, Mass. I am executive vice president of the Massachusetts Audubon Society, which happens to be the largest and oldest State society in the United States.

Our entire reason for existence is the preservation of wildlife and the beauty of the outdoors as very important human resources. You have in front of you a copy of our statement made to your committee approximately a year ago, and it would be superfluous for me to go into that in any detail other than to simply comment that the out of doors is tremendously important to people for their enjoyment; wildlife is only a part of that, but the habitat, the out of doors itself, is vital to the existence and the surviving of much of our bird and animal life.

I would like to add specifically that I think it is safe to predict that never in the future will we have the opportunity to add any land to the park. Therefore, I think it is tremendously important to resist any tendency to strip from the proposal vital areas such as Morris

Island and Monomoy, the Jeremy Point-Great Island area, or the province lands at Provincetown. In this latter connection, I think perhaps it is worth while to note something which may not have been brought to your attention, that the province lands were acquired many years ago by a private organization and turned over to the State, at least with moral obligation that they would be retained as open space for the enjoyment of the public as a whole, and that any tendency to take away land now owned by the State under the Department of Natural Resources and turn it back for private development would be a very serious moral offense against the original intent of the gift.

I would be happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you very much, Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Cook, I should like to ask you a question, please. Do I understand from your statement that your chamber of commerce is opposed to the establishment of a national seashore park on Cape Cod?

Mr. Cook. We can't answer that one directly. As we explained to you several times, both in Washington and, I think, again in our brief, we have a long history in our organization since 1925, as a matter of fact, in favor of conservation and land use planning. We have felt all along that there hasn't been enough information for anyone to truly make a decision as respects this proposition that you have before you.

Mrs. Pfost. In other words, you feel that there has not been sufficient study given to the area for any portion of Cape Cod to be turned into a national seashore?

Mr. Cook. Or any kind of public lands. We think it requires very careful study, particularly when you have 30,000 acres in this small area to be suddenly taken over and taken out of use. We don't believe there has been enough study given to that yet.

I tried to make one or two points we thought were fairly obvious as respects the economy survey that was made. There is a great conflict here. Are we to protect these natural things or are we going to have to have public tent sites? It doesn't seem from the testimony you just had that we can have both and we think there should be a provision written in there by the Congress making it absolutely clear what the Congress has in mind if they create this park. Is it for conservation or is it for public accommodation?

Mrs. Pfost. I want to call attention to one statement you have made on page 1 of your prepared statement. You say, "We are told that this is the first time that a national park has been proposed in a developed area." This subcommittee held 2 days of field hearings and went on a sightseeing tour for an additional day, in connection with the Oregon Dunes Seashores proposal last year. There are many residences in that area. There are a couple of fresh water lakes that are involved as well as these summer homes and permanent homes. So, for your information, I may say that the committee has had other hearings on a similar area. Of course, they are different in topography and various other respects, but nonetheless, conditions are similar and we are giving consideration to establishment of a national seashore there.

Mr. Cook. Perhaps, Madam Chairman, we should have changed that to, "This is the first time one has been created." As I understand, most national parks in the past have been created from wilderness land and lands in a great many instances already owned by the Federal Government, and it wasn't necessary to go into a highly developed area and take land. That was the thought in mind our people had in that respect. We know of these other propositions at Padre Island and in Oregon, and we are not too familiar with the exact conditions there. But we are saying there has never been a park created in a congested area.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you.

Mr. Bates, I would like to clarify one question. I, of course, have not had an opportunity to go over this long study.

Mr. Bates. Certainly.

Mrs. Pfost. And, therefore, I do not know whether you mean, when you speak of establishing or setting up an independent study, that it is this study that should be given consideration, or that an entirely different independent study should be made?

Mr. Bates. We have developed this as an independent study to help insofar as we possibly could, in a sincere and honest way, at this particular time. We are trying to help make progress.

We believe from the last few months, from very deep meditation on this thing, that we are right when we say that we think official studies should be made by the National Park Service, by the Department of the Interior, by your own congressional committees, to try to figure out how this country can get what it possibly can in the way of these reasonably large-sized open areas that are still available in densely populated areas for the future recreation of this country.

The President's Outdoor Recreation Review Commission, of course, is dealing with the problems of America and what it wants in the way of recreation right up to the year 2000. That is understood, and they report this coming few months from now. Whatever America is going to do in the way of recreation it has to do here and now. It has two areas for that. As Mr. Nickerson pointed out, tenting, for example, is one form of recreation and it should not be in this narrow land here. We have suggested in that report 50,000 acres, over 75 square miles, right up in back of Plymouth there, where the density of population is under 20 per square mile. Down here, on the Cape, if the National Park Service were to go through with their plan, as it stood, they would take 30,000 out of about 60,000 acres on this little lower cape here. That is terrific.

Now, Kinney and Willacy Counties in which Padre Island is located only have 10.5 people per square mile. They are separated from the rest of the counties by a vast lagoon. Padre Island is only a small percentage of the counties it involves. There is no comparison with the Cape Cod situation and exactly the same thing is true about Cape Hatteras.

Mrs. Pfost. I was going to call your attention, Mr. Bates, to the fact that both Congressman Ullman and I are members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. Of course, that Commission's report is not ready and will not be for approximately a year, but the Commission is giving due consideration to each of the seashore areas as well as wilderness areas, national park areas, community parks, State parks, all types of parks, and recreation areas. I am sure that some very helpful guidance will come from the ORRRC report. But I was in a quandary as to the direction you felt the independent study you spoke of should take.

Mr. BATES. You will find we have referred to their work in one section of our report. I have talked at some length with Mr. Sargent on these matters, and I am conversant with all of the literature published so far by the Commission. It is doing a terrific job and I simply feel its work must be supplemented by professional study of what areas it is possible to acquire of a size great enough that perhaps will require a combination of both Federal and State, both financial and supervision, some systems of checks and balances that will make a new and happier era ahead of this country here on an outdoor recreational and conservation basis.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you, Mr. Bates.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. Ullman.

Mr. ULLMAN. Before you leave the stand, Mr. Bates, I want to commend you on what I consider will be very interesting and inspirational reading, and I intend to look into it.

Mr. BATES. Thank you, sir.

Mr. ULLMAN. There is a question in my mind, however, about this new park concept of yours. You recognize the fact that this national seashore idea is something new that the Park Service has been advancing in order to attempt to preserve the diminishing seashore areas of the country. They have applied it here and in Oregon and I imagine in other places throughout the country.

Now, what is your view toward this new concept that the Park Service has developed?

Mr. BATES. It is very simply stated. I simply think that a professional and efficient study exploring this whole field of research which I have just mentioned here, this concept of regional parks, would result not in meddling with the present National Park Act, but writing a brand new section into it to provide for a system of regional parks. It is as simple as that. In other words, a brand new technique seems possible to be indicated. I do not say that I am right on it. I simply think that the matter should be thoroughly and carefully and immediately explored.

Mr. ULLMAN. The problem arises, who is to run the parks. I agree fully, and I think most members of the Recreation Resources Commission also agree that we need regional planning in park development. You are, I understand, proposing a new agency or new coordinating group that would administer the new park concept.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Congressman, what I am really proposing is perhaps a new principle we might say. It is a twofold principle. The principle just as you have a system of financing urban renewal, so we would call this rural renewal on a great scale and have two-thirds financing by the Government and one-third by the State.

Mr. ULLMAN. But who would run it?

Mr. BATES. Then, automatically three men who occupy ex officio certain offices would have the power to run it. One would be the regional director of the National Park Service. That would be region 5, in this case here. Second would be the commissioner of natural resources and conservation, Mr. Foster, for example, at the present time, in Massachusetts and third would be Commissioner Lockhart, the chairman of the county commissioners of Barnstable County. In other words, three ex officio men so as to represent the Federal Government, the State, both of whom have contributed financially, and the people of the area.

Mr. ULLMAN. I am not going to go into it further. I just want to add by way of conclusion, it takes not just three administrators, but it takes a great army of personnel and tradition to operate a park service. We have a National Park Service, and we have State park services. If we attempted to develop a new park service on the basis you are talking about, with a new army of personnel, it seems to me it may be very confusing.

Mr. BATES. This would be a new technique within the existing setup, Mr. Congressman, to a great degree, as I envision it.

Mr. ULLMAN. Possibly operated by National Park Service personnel?

Mr. BATES. Oh, yes; but having on the supervisory board or commission, the representatives of State and of the county. That is all. It is food for thought. That is all.

Mr. ULLMAN. And I accept it that way. Those of us who deal closely with the National Park Service will recognize that attempts to superimpose some other type of agency control over National Park Service personnel would present a very serious administrative problem.

Mr. BATES. Yes, sir. This report we have spent a lot of time and effort on is simply a serious effort to be constructive and helpful as a prelude to even further research which we think should be made upon some governmental level that will help to solve what we are almost positive is a major problem confronting us.

Mr. ULLMAN. I hope you will make copies available to the Commission.

Mr. BATES. Copies have already gone down to Washington.

Mr. ULLMAN. Thank you very much.

One other question to the gentleman from the chamber of commerce. Mr. Cook, I am rather amazed by your testimony for the chambers of commerce. Does your organization represent all of the chambers from all of the towns in the lower cape?

Mr. COOK. No; we are an organization composed of about 1,000 citizens capewide, having begun in 1921. We have some 11 other chambers of commerce that represent their towns and villages to various degrees, and generally deal with problems at a different level, more local.

Mr. ULLMAN. You have no association whatsoever with local chambers of commerce of the towns?

Mr. COOK. Not officially. We work very closely with them; yes, sir.

Mr. ULLMAN. But officially, you have no connection?

Mr. COOK. No, sir.

Mr. ULLMAN. I would have been rather amazed to have the chambers of commerce from the towns back up your statement. We came here to get information from local citizens and organizations but you have given us only an overwhelmingly negative statement which does not offer anything in the way of constructive suggestion for the committee. What essentially does the chamber want here in the way of development? Do you want more people on the cape, or do you want less people on the cape? [Laughter.]

Mr. COOK. Essentially, we represent all the people and we think their aspirations and desires for more stable year-round economy. Our Plymouth population has grown as I explained, and perhaps you are aware, in the last 10 years 50 percent, probably one of the fastest growing counties in the United States. Those people who live here the year around, not the visitors. And we see a great future for Cape Cod in developing a year-round economy. It seems to me, at least, and many of our members, that to superimpose this park upon our present economy and what looks to us very suspiciously like an attempt to establish a tremendous free campground is that we will be cursed forever with a seasonal economy. Today we have in this county a $500,000 deficit in unemployment compensation. I do not know if you realize what that means.

What it means is this: Unemployment compensation, as you know, is paid by the State and collected from the employers. Our employers contribute, but the rest of the State, the rest of Massachusetts, for example, has to pay into it, to us and to this county every year $500,000 a year in unemployment compensation. That is just one indication of the seasonal nature of our economy. We are trying to overcome that and we don't believe that if these 30,000 acres are going to be turned into a tenting ground we will ever be able to overcome that tendency we now live with.

To understand our position, you must understand the economic history of Cape Cod. After the Civil War, we went through 80 years of depression. It was so bad in 1895 that our State legislature caused an investigation to be made to find out why, as they put it, the original inhabitants of the county were leaving it so rapidly and the reason was, of course, there was no way for them to earn a living.

Now, things were at their very lowest in 1920 and that is when our organization was established. We went through a great many years of attempting to have the land reused to find gainful employment for the people who are here. We tried agriculture and we tried farming and fishing, and finally, it became apparent that the so-called vacationers were willing to come to our land, willing to bring their money in and willing to enjoy the things we could provide.

We have built on that basis, but since World War II there has been another factor in the picture and that is retired people and commuters and they are most desirable people because they stay with us the year around in the majority of cases. They aren't a seasonal business. If Cape Cod is to survive, we must continue to plan to try to attract year-round consumers into our area.

We are largely a service-oriented community, most of our people are trained in the services, in the professions. We have little, if any, manufacturing, our fishing and farming and manufacturing only contribute less than 10 percent of our economy. All the rest comes from service trade.

To have this tentsite business go on, which we fear—and I will tell you why we fear it. We have tried to discuss this with the National Park Service. We have tried to discuss several aspects of this law with the National Park Service and to my knowledge we don't get satisfactory answers. They indicate on their map, for instance, I think, five tenting areas. We would like to know from them just how many tentsites they propose to put in there. They talk about having some of our land that we can use this way or that way, providing we adopt zoning regulations approved by the Secretary or the Director of the National Park Service. They have been studying this proposition since 1954 with professional help, help that we have never had as yet.

Some young fellows came to our office in 1954 and told us they were going to look this land over, told us what they had in mind, and we agreed to cooperate. The very next thing we knew was 3 or 4 or 5 years later we picked up a Sunday edition of the newspaper and found they had a plan. They never came back again seeking our point of view in this matter, getting any local information that they could. So we are very skeptical that if the Congress creates this park without some definite restrictions written into the law, it will be well administered. I have been told this is hair splitting, and I have been told the proper viewpoint here is to let the National Park Service have this land, that they are reasonable people, and, after it is all over, they will sit down and discuss the details with us.

We like to take the other point of view. We would like to have them sit down and discuss the details with us before this act becomes effective. Because we have seen it here today—and I do not mean to criticize Commissioner Foster—when he began to describe to you our State park in Cape Cod today he almost overlooked the most recent park he has created down here in the way of tentsites. We have, just over the town line a very short ways from here, a State park that has been unusually well run. We have talked to many of the people in the town of Brewster where this park is located, and the reports they give us of the people that occupy the tentsites that they are the most desirable citizens, and I wouldn't want you to go away with the impression that we in any way object to tentsites, the types of people, or their condition.

From all we know, and all we have observed, they are a very high type and we would like to see them continue to come here. But we can see in the limited amount of land we have that we could be overwhelmed. To show you what happens in an administrative situation such as this, early in the history of our organization one of the things we worked on was reforestation of Cape Cod, and we caused to be created in the town of Sandwich a small woodlot experimental reforestation station, Shoreham State Forest.

Without any consultation, as far as we know, with local officials, the division of natural resources of the department of natural resources in our State suddenly decided to put tentsites in that area. Now, there isn't a lake or a pond or a stream or a beach; it is just a woodlot alongside the road in the town of Sandwich, and the most recent newspaper report I saw was that that area is going to have 400 tents.

Here is an area taken for experimental reforestation, and suddenly the pressure is so great over here on Brewster, and I suppose the pressure on the director was so great by citizens outside the area who were disappointed when they couldn't get a tent site, that finally in desperation, he decided to relieve the pressure a little bit and put 400 tent sites in this wood lot. That is what I mean by administrative decisions. There is so much of this in this proposed bill, that we are very fearful we will be cursed with a seasonal economy from now on. We can see that if you go into Wellfleet, for example, and take 75 percent of their land—in that town now there are a large number of very highly desirable retired people. If you take 75 percent of the land, have unrestricted campsites in there, those people just will not stay. They don't have any reason to stay here. Their income comes from somewhere else, and they can move away tomorrow. And we don't want to be faced with that situation.

We would like to see conservation. As I pointed to a report here of one of the divisions of the department of natural resources, there is a proposition before our towns to take 30,000 acres for conservation purposes, but spread it out throughout the entire county, not concentrate it. We think that sort of thing would be beneficial to us. We are afraid that 30,000 acres in this restricted area here will overwhelm us with a seasonal economy we cannot live with.

Mr. ULLMAN. Thank you, Mr. Cook. I just want to make one statement which does not require an answer. The chambers of commerce here and all over the country recognize the fact that one of the major industries is the tourist industry. People all over this land from end to end, are competing to attract tourists and tourist investment.

Now, the chambers of commerce up and down the Cape here issue elaborate brochures to attract people to their community and I assume that they want them to come and they want them to spend money. This is the one industry that the future of the Cape is dependent upon. I think there is no question about it. You are not going to get smokestacks, you do not want smokestacks, you are not going to get payrolls of any substantial type, other than in the tourist industry because this is the nature of the land. But it is an industry that is desirable. It is an industry you seek and you want. I think you are going to have to make up your mind what your objectives are. Do you want people or do you not want people? We have heard about the threat of campsites over and over and over again. It is a problem we are going to have from coast to coast, more campsites. What we want from you are constructive suggestions rather than the negative kind of approach we received from the chamber, which says we do not want anything except further study. Some place along the line, we are going to have to make some decisions or this beautiful area and other similar areas around the country are not going to be available simply because they have been overexploited and developed in the wrong way. Somebody is going to have to make a decision soon. Somewhere along the line, we are going to have to stop studying and take some action.

Mr. COOK. Madam Chairman, if I could make one comment. We are a vacation economy and the pamphlets you refer to are ours, and we do want vacationers to come here. But we do see a possibility and we know the desire and need for gradual change of that economy from a 2-month economy to a year-round economy, and that is why we suggested there be further studies made to make sure the creation of the park, as now proposed, won't preclude any further possibility along that line.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you, Mr. Cook. Does that complete your statement?

Mr. COOK. Yes, madam.

Mrs. PFOST. The gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Bates, you have a rather interesting and intriguing proposal here which I understand is based upon a cooperative effort between the States and the Federal Government in the solution of this problem. Is that correct?

Mr. BATES. We hope that we have discovered a technique that might help the whole country. We don't know what we are talking about yet; but we just hope so.

Mr. CHENOWETH. There is nothing here that applies peculiarly to this area, but in general.

Mr. BATES. No, indeed. I simply say it is barely possible that this particular Cape Cod park might be the pilot of the test project to explore this new principle more carefully. We have done so much already with the Cape State park situation, and know so much about that, if we find fitted the new principle, we propose, maybe it would be the perfect way in which to solve this problem to everybody's satisfaction.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am rather inclined to think it would have to be either an all Federal or all State project. That is my opinion.

Mr. BATES. That is a major point on which at the present time, with all respect to you, sir, I would differ with you. I would feel there must be some way under our Constitution in which in a matter like this the State and the Federal Government can work out a cooperative program. At least, I would hope that to be the case.

Mr. CHENOWETH. This places a limitation on the National Park Service.

Mr. BATES. That is physically true, yes, sir.

Mrs. PFOST. The gentleman from Alaska, Mr. Rivers.

Mr. RIVERS. No questions, Madam Chairman. Thank you very much, gentlemen, for your constructive statements.

Mrs. PFOST. Our next witness will be Mr. Ben H. Thompson, Chief, Recreational Resources Planning Division, National Park Service. He will be accompanied to the witness stand by Mr. Frank E. Harrison, Special Assistant to the Director, National Park Service. Mr. Ronald F. Lee, Regional Director, Region V, National Park Service, Philadelphia, Pa., will accompany Mr. Harrison and Mr. Thompson.

While they are coming to the witness stand, I should like to say that Director Conrad L. Wirth was on his way here from Chicago. His plane circled the airfield of Boston several times and finally took him on to New York, where he had to be deplaned. So he is not able to attend this afternoon. Mr. Thompson will give Director Wirth's testimony, I believe.

Mr. Thompson, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF CONRAD L. WIRTH, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, AS PRESENTED BY BEN H. THOMPSON, CHIEF, RECREATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING DIVISION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, ACCOMPANIED BY FRANK HARRISON, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, AND RONALD F. LEE, REGIONAL DIRECTOR, REGION V, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, Madam Chairman, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen.

Mrs. Pfost has told you about Mr. Wirth's attempt to reach here. He has a very difficult schedule for this week, and was flying last night in an attempt to be here today at the hearing. She told you that the plane was unable to land, and he had to return to New York and is now returning to Washington. I know he regrets this very much because he considered this an extremely important occasion. I have his statement here, however, and because it is late, and since the committee will want to hear as many people here as possible, and we are available in Washington, I would like to simply have the statement inserted in the record if that is approriate at this time.

Mrs. PFOST. Without objection, it will be so ordered. Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

(Statement of Director Wirth follows:)

STATEMENT OF CONRAD L. WIRTH, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Madam Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, in meeting here to weigh the merits of authorizing a Cape Cod National Seashore, you are considering perhaps the last opportunity this Nation will have to save a seashore of national significance north of Cape Hatteras.

For the portion of Cape Code proposed for preservation as a national seashore is not only the most extensive natural shoreline area in New England but one of the finest on the North Atlantic coast.

We can better understand how important, rare, and brief, is this opportunity when we reflect how many opportunities there were just 20 years ago to preserve outstanding seashore and lakeshore sites, and how few there are left today.

The proposed Cape Cod National Seashore, for instance, together with Cape Hatteras, are the last 2 remaining of 12 outstanding seashores recommended for preservation in national ownership during the 1930's. Hatteras was saved. Cape Cod can still be so. Much of the other shoreline recommended for preservation at that time, however, has vanished under developments.

Five years ago the National Park Service published a report of its 2-year survey of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts to identify the best remaining opportunities to preserve areas of seashore for public enjoyment. That report, entitled "Our Vanishing Shoreline," stated: "Almost every attractive seashore area on our Atlantic and Gulf coasts has been preempted for commercial or private development. Only a fraction of our long seacoast is left for public use, and much of this small portion is rapidly disappearing before our eyes."

The report further stated: "In summary, the findings show that almost every attractive seashore area from Maine to Mexico that is accessible by road has been developed, has been acquired for development purposes, or is being considered for its development possibilities."

The survey and the report identified the outer arm of Cape Cod as the best remaining opportunity to preserve a national seashore north of Cape Hatteras. Cape Cod is within easy reach of the most densely settled portion of our country.

We arrived at this conclusion after studying 3,700 miles of the Atlantic and Gulf seashore and comparing the character and combinations of park values—scenic, natural, and scientific interest, historic and archelogic interest, suitability and adaptability to appropriate public use, integrity of areas, relative degree of freedom from conflicting developments, and feasibility of park establishment—of the areas studied. The 1955 conclusion regarding Cape Cod bore out the findings of an earlier, less intensive seashore survey we had made 20 years before, in 1935.

Following the issuance of the seashore report, philanthropic foundations, which had financed the survey and the publication of the report, made further donations for more detailed study of the park potentialities of Cape Cod. These studies continued for another 2 years and included study of the lower cape from the points of view of geology, biology, archeology, landscape values, architecture, park planning, and the probable economic effect of park establishment on the cape. These studies were conscientiously and painstakingly conducted. It was not easy to draw boundaries, as it was with, say, Yellowstone and Yosemite, for the cape has been inhabited for more than 300 years. There are established and historic communities situated at various places on the lower cape and there is a traditional Cape Cod atmosphere and way of life, with which any park proposal should be consistent and harmonious.

Our studies led to a Cape Cod National Seashore proposal, which was made public with the permission of the Secretary of the Interior in March 1959. The proposal outlined a boundary similar to that shown on the large map prepared for this hearing. The boundary encompasses an unusual combination and variety of park values, of exceptional cultural and public significance, in a relatively small, ribbon-like area of some 29,000 acres—smaller than any national park except Virgin Islands, Hot Springs, and Platt—that would still preserve for the indefinite future the delightful and unique character of the cape, on about one-eighth of the area of the cape.

The reasons and purposes of the proposal were set forth in a brochure called Cape Cod National Seashore—A Proposal and in the more detailed field investigation report. These reports, in answer to inquiries, were widely distributed, together with questions and answers regarding the proposal. I and members of my staff have explained aspects of the proposal personally to more than a thousand persons here on the cape, and we have conferred with the boards of selectmen of the six towns affected in efforts to resolve many of the inevitable problems which arise in such a proposal. In addition, my Washington and regional office staffs have endeavored to answer questions concerning it in replying to a heavy flow of correspondence.

Your recent tour of the lower cape, even though made in wintertime, has familiarized you with some of the scenic qualities of this last unspoiled shoreline area of its size in New England. You have undoubtedly felt also the historic atmosphere of Cape Cod, first landing place of the Pilgrims. You will be interested to know that during the summers of 1959 and 1960 the Historic American Buildings Survey conducted a special architectural and historical study of Cape Cod. During the first summer approximately 70 buildings or architectural and historical value were identified within the boundaries of the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore. This past summer the survey program was carried forward by the production of measured drawings representing 16 historic buildings, mainly in Truro, Wellfleet, and Eastham, and 37 sets of architectural and historical writeups were completed as well as important photography work.

Scientific factors are also important here: the geology of the cape with its evidence of continental glaciation and of the work of winds and currents forming the dunes and bars; the wealth of wildlife as well. Cape Cod is a haven for birds. It is also a mingling place of northern and southern plant species.

The proposed national seashore extends the length of the lower cape, including Monomoy Island. It includes not only the great beach area, the bold sandy shore facing the Atlantic, but other features as well. At Provincetown and Truro are 8 square miles of some of the most spectacular sand dunes along the Atlantic coast. In Provincetown this dune zone is backed up by an area of woods, ponds and marshes noted as a bird habitat and providing an important entrance zone into this outer section of the proposed seashore.

In addition to Truro's dunes and heathlands, and the spectacular oceanside cliffs, such as those near the Cape Cod Lighthouse, the river valleys of the Pamet and Little Pamet are also important national seashore areas. They not only are of geological and biological signifiance but also compose an historic district containing some 27 pre-1850 homes.

In Truro and Wellfleet, the boundary we have proposed extends across the Cape to embrace a section of the Cape Cod Bay shore and the remote and beautiful Jeremy Point area. This western region includes not only the Herring River estuary and marshlands but scenic and historic uplands as well. Bound Brook Island, once the site of old Wellfleet Village, has five houses of historic interest. From the high land of Griffin Island, perhaps the geographical key to this whole section of the park, one can view a scenic complex of upland and marsh typical of the Cape.

The glacial kettlehole ponds of Wellfleet and Truro form one of the prime natural features of the entire proposal. These secluded and scenic ponds are of four general types resulting from drainage factors and relative exposure to wind, and each type displays a distinct association of plant and animal life.

The portion of the proposed seashore in Eastham includes broad woodlands that provide exceptional wildlife habitat. The lands in Eastham surrounding Salt Pond Bay are highly scenic. They are of great importance also in interpreting the geology of Cape Cod, since many significant glacial deposits exist within the proposed boundaries only here.

South of Eastham the proposed national seashore is restricted to the barrier beach and related islands which have outstanding natural values. These islands, Pochet, Sampson, and Hog, are significant also for their aesthetic appeal, and they are the only examples of the sandwich moraine, the last major ice age deposit on the Cape, existing within the proposed boundaries.

Morris Island in Chatham is a superb natural area, which not only contains a rare white cedar bog and a stand of beech forest, but also has been called probably one of the most important bird resting and feeding grounds, acre for acre, in New England. And one of the two or three most important such habitats on the entire Atlantic seaboard.

These are some of the features that give significance to the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore. They are discussed in greater detail in the technical portions of the Field Investigation Report, copies of which are available to the committee. The problem was to find suitable boundaries for preservation of these diverse features.

In suggesting the proposed boundary, we also gave careful consideration to such park planning requirements as the potentialities for its appropriate uses by the visiting public; the need for suitable and safe entrances; means of moving from place to place in the seashore in safety and in such manner as to make a seashore visit enjoyable; public use facilities such as visitor centers, administrative and headquarters sites, and the minimum land needed to accomplish these purposes. In other words, the seashore, if it is to succeed both as a conservation device and as a public use area, must be such that we can provide sensible and orderly protection, development and use within it. This will not be possible if it is pared down or dismembered into several or more separate and isolated tracts.

In our studies, we also tried to give the fullest possible consideration to the probable effects of the proposed national seashore on the neighboring communities. You will note that the community centers of Provincetown, Truro, Wellfleet, Eastham, Orleans, and Chatham, are all outside of the recommended boundary. The most recent maps and other data available to us show that in the four lower cape towns, there remains for community expansion and development, outside of the proposed national seashore, 452 acres in Provincetown, 2,000 acres in Truro, 2,516 acres in Wellfleet, and 2,815 acres in Eastham, in addition to marshland and presently developed land. Recognizing that there is room for honest difference of opinion over the development potentialities of any particular site, nevertheless, our analysis shows that in these four lower towns there is still more potential community development area remaining outside of the proposed park than is developed today in these communities, after some 300 years of occupancy.

The Cape Cod National Seashore and other, similar, proposals for gulf and Pacific coast areas were followed up by the introduction of a bill sponsored by the Department of the Interior to authorize the establishment of three national seashores. In addition, numerous bills were introduced to save specific seashore areas. H.R. 9050, by Congressman Keith, and the companion bill of Senators Kennedy and Saltonstall, S. 2636, are among the bills relating to specific seashores. You have the Department of the Interior's report of May 18, 1960, on H.R. 9050, and five identical bills to establish the Cape Cod National Seashore Park. While expressing a preference for a bill authorizing the establishment of three areas, of which Cape Cod is one, the Department stated it has no objection to the enactment of H.R. 9050, if amended. The amendments are set out in the Department's report of May 18, 1960, which should be considered with the related report of April 15, 1960.

The bills which Representative Keith, Senators Kennedy, and Saltonstall and several other Congressmen have introduced would authorize the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore, essentially as I have described it to you. Moreover, these bills, like the planning studies preceding them, charted new ground in national park conservation. The bills carefully and specifically stated the conservation and public use objectives of the proposed national seashore and they also contained a number of special provisions to safeguard the interests of the people and communities of the six towns of the lower cape. The Department of the Interior agreed with most of these special safeguard provisions, but did recommend certain amendments in the reports I have cited.

The major provisions included in H.R. 9050 to safeguard the interests of the people and communities on the cape are:

1. That State and town lands within the proposed national seashore could be acquired for park purposes only with the concurrence of the owners.
2. If owners of improved property within the proposed area wish to do so, they may retain either a 25-year or lifetime interest for residential purposes.
3. Suspension of the power of eminent domain as a means of acquiring improved residential property within the proposed park for 1 year after enactment of the bill, and thereafter as long as such property should be covered by town zoning consistent with the purposes of the park and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill defines improved residential property as that on which construction was begun before September 1, 1959. This date must have been chosen to prevent a rash of speculative development pending consideration of the measure by the Congress. The destructive speculations which have been started in the study area since the Cape Cod National Seashore was proposed make this danger apparent and show the wisdom of the September 1, 1959, cutoff date provided in Mr. Keith's bill.

4. Suspension of the power of eminent domain as a means of acquiring commercial property within the proposed park pending decision on an application for permit for such property.
5. Designation by the Secretary of the Interior of a specified amount of undeveloped land within the proposed park for development—the so-called 10-percent provision.
6. Requiring the Secretary as soon as possible after the enactment of the bill to issue regulations to govern zoning standards for consideration by the towns. The bill would require only that such standards be consistent with the purposes of the national seashore. Such zoning standards naturally would not be concerned with town matters not related to the park conservation program.
7. Payments in lieu of taxes for a period of 3 years for all properties acquired, in fee, during the 25 years following enactment of the bill.
8. Authorization to continue hunting and fishing and the taking of shellfish within the proposed national seashore, in areas agreed upon by the Secretary and the State game and fish authorities. The taking of shellfish would continue as heretofore.
9. The establishment of a Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission to advise the Secretary on all important matters affecting the proposed national seashore.

These are extraordinary provisions in national park legislation and should make possible the establishment of the park and acquisition of land for its public purposes, with minimum disruption of community life. We were unable to agree with the so-called 10 percent provision, section 5 of the bill, which would require the Secretary to designate additional undeveloped land within the national seashore for development. Our predicament was that there was no fat in our proposed boundaries; they had already been pared to the bone for the express purpose of leaving undisturbed as much potential community development area as possible and still have a national seashore of national significance.

At this point I would emphasize my strong belief that the answer to this problem will best be found in more careful town and community planning, as Professor Chermayeff has said, rather than in more town expansion. Such expansion within the proposed national seashore cannot be accomplished without damaging the very scenes, character, and other park values which the proposed park is intended to preserve. To consume the landscape on which the cape's vacation economy depends can bring only dubious and transitory financial benefits which in the long run will amount to far less than the economic benefits of a national seashore. Moreover, the ocean will eventually stop the expansion of developments here; they cannot be counted on to continue indefinitely. And when the remaining natural landscape is used up, our national birthright, Cape Cod's beauty, will have been spent.

Early this year an economic study relating to the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore was made as a part of our studies. The report, by the competent firm of Economic Development Associates, Inc., of Boston, concluded: "It must be recognized, however, that without the park, a change in the area is inevitable. An extension of existing growth patterns that are currently creating tax revenue are at the same time reducing the very values which have made the area attractive, and increasingly so each year.

"The establishment of the national seashore park will have many positive economic effects on the area. It is estimated that as a direct result of the visitation generated in the first few years after the opening of the park, a total of over $30 million in capital expenditures on commercial facilities (including retail trade, service, and personal accommodations) and on the park facilities will be made. Just on the basis of an estimated increment of 1 million visitor-days which would result in 4 years if the rate of growth were similar to that experienced at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park, direct wage payments should increase by $2,800,000 annually.

"Since the park is being established in order to preserve the cape's beautiful scenery, its interesting geology, its wealth of plant and animal life, and its colorful history, and since such preservation is in the long-range interest of the cape and the lower cape towns directly affected, it is felt that in establishing the bounds of the park no compromises should be made that would conflict with its initial purpose or ultimate objectives. To do so would not best serve either the interests of the park or of the towns involved." Copies of the economic report, from which I have just quoted, are available for the committee, if they are desired.

Further on the subject of community growth, I quote briefly from William H. Whyte, Jr., in the January 1958 issue of Fortune: "* * * Where the new developments are scattered at random in the outlying areas, the costs of providing services become excruciating. There is not only the cost of running sewers and water mains and storm drains out to Happy Acres, but much more road, per family served, has to be paved and maintained.

"Who foots the bill for the extra cost of services? Not the new people. Conventional tax practice spreads the load so that those who require the least services have to make up the difference. Where it will cost about $30 per household to furnish homes in town with water, it will cost about $80 to provide water for the outlying developments; since the water rate will be uniform, the townspeople have to make up most of the added cost."

Questions have been raised a number of times by thoughtful people on the cape regarding the nature and extent of the Federal Government's share in the cost of utilities, police, and other public services that will be required by the establishment of the park and the construction of park facilities to serve the visitors. The Government will pay its full share of such cost. Utilities required by the seashore and its visitors will be provided by the Government through the purchase of such utility services from the owners of existing systems, or the Government will provide the necessary systems for the seashore if its requirements cannot otherwise be satisfactorily met.

We will, of course, assume all maintenance of any roads to which the Federal Government receives title inside the seashore boundaries. Our rangers and maintenance men will police and care for the public seashore lands. Town or county roads outside the seashore which are heavily used by seashore traffic can, I am sure, receive the benefit of Federal-aid road construction funds through the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In addition, all studies of the economic impact of this proposed national seashore predicts a prosperous future for the lower cape towns in serving visitors over a lengthened visitation season. I feel sure that the towns will enjoy adequate resources from additional revenues gained from visitor expenditures and increased realty values to support the additional public services required of the towns in their respective jurisdictions.

There will be careful planning to do if a Cape Cod National Seashore is authorized, not only by the National Park Service in preparing a master plan for the preserve but by the towns together to insure that their communities continue to grow in quality. We of the National Park Service will always stand ready to cooperate with the towns in planning matters whenever they request our assistance. Of course, the Urban Renewal Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is authorized to make grants to match State and local funds for the purpose of financing comprehensive planning for the smaller cities and counties throughout the country.

Another question that has been asked is for information on the manner in which the proposed national seashore would be administered and the reasonable expectation that people may have regarding the future character of the park, if it is established along the general lines of the pending bill. In answer to a request from Senators Kennedy and Saltonstall, the Secretary of the Interior sent a statement on March 31, 1960, a copy of which is appended to my statement and from which I quote:

"The basic concept governing the type of use and management of the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore is stated in the act of 1916 which established the National Park Service * * * 'which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.'

"This concept has been translated into a body of basic policies, procedures, and standards that are well established and that govern the work of the Service throughout the Nation. As applied to Cape Cod, these policies and standards call for the following approach to preservation and use.

> "1. Halt impairment of the natural and historic features.
>
> "2. Protect and preserve the natural features and retain the life and atmosphere of the seafaring era and historic Cape Cod.
>
> "3. Rehabilitate or restore features already impaired.
>
> "4. Keep to a minimum the disruption of the life of each town during and after the transitional period from existing land-uses to park-uses.
>
> "5. Cooperate closely with the adjacent towns in the planning of approaches and adjacent land area to assure that town and park relationship will be harmonious.
>
> "6. Provide for the use and enjoyment of the area through properly located facilities, interpretative and other visitor services, as described more fully below."

I cannot take the time of the committee to quote the remainder of the policy statement from which I have just read. However, the statement has, I believe, been widely distributed on the cape, and additional copies of it have been made available at this hearing. It clearly shows that the proposed national seashore is for appropriate public use—not to be misused or used up.

I do not believe, for example, that camping should be permitted near the ponds. It would be damaging to that delicate complex of natural features. The same is true, I think, of Morris Island. Its importance as a natural area, as a bird habitat, is such that I believe that it should be managed along the lines of Monomoy National Wildlife Refuge, where human activity is limited in the interests of wildlife and plantlife therein protected.

In conclusion, I would like to say that although many property owners here are at present maintaining their land in a manner in keeping with the cape's traditional atmosphere, there is no assurance that they will or that they can continue to do so. The only insurance for preserving a representative and significant portion of Cape Cod unspoiled for future generations to enjoy is in appropriate public ownership. In view of Cape Cod's fame, and of the national significance of its natural and historic values, I believe that such appropriate public ownership should be as a national seashore.

The committee in its tour of the cape has seen construction scars at many places within the proposed national seashore. Nearly all of these are the result of construction activity begun since the proposed national seashore has been under consideration. It is clearly evident, in my opinion, that in a very few years the charming and delightful character of the proposed park will have vanished for all time under such developments, unless suitable action is taken in the very near future to acquire and preserve this area for public inspiration and enjoyment. The time within which such effective action can be taken is rapidly running out.

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE IN ANSWER TO THE CRITICISM THAT THE AREA PROPOSED FOR THE CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE IS NOT REALLY ALL NEEDED FOR PARK USE

In determining boundaries for the proposed Cape Code National Seashore, the National Park Service tried to see to it that adequate examples of all the natural and historic elements which go to make up the significance of Cape Cod were encompassed by those boundaries. Most careful study went into the boundary determination, and compromises with the principles of good park planning were carried to the limit at which they could be justified within the framework of the conservation effort in order to protect developed areas and leave room for their additional growth.

The province lands, a public reservation for some 300 years, were all included in the proposal, since these lands embrace some of the most spectacular sand dunes on the North Atlantic coast as well as splendid beaches. This tip of the cape, which is of postglacial origin, offers outstanding examples of deposition and erosion.

Closer to Provincetown the province lands include a natural reach of woods, ponds, and marshlands, noted for birdlife and exhibiting the effects of dune stabilization by plant growth. This region, long enjoyed as a public reserve by the citizens of Provincetown, can continue to provide a natural area close to the town and an important entrance zone into a major portion of the seashore.

In Truro, the land proposed for inclusion in the Cape Cod National Seashore contains dunes in the vicinity of Pilgrim Lake, the historic site of Pilgrim Spring and headlands facing the Atlantic for which Cape Cod's shoreline is perhaps most famous. Other areas inland in Truro include heathlands typical of the lower cape and significant for their plant communities. These heathlands comprise portions of the Truro Plain and Wellfleet Plain, two important geographical evidences of the glacial age. The Highland Road-Cape Cod Lighthouse portion of the Cape Cod National Seashore is of particular importance, not only because of the spectacular qualities of the ocean bluffs here or of the fame of the lighthouse itself, but also because of its strategic location in providing adequate access to the proposed seashore and because of the visibility of the area from far points within the park.

Highland Road intersects the new U.S. 6 with a grade separation and modified cloverleaf interchange. It becomes a logical entrance point to the proposed seashore from North Truro, Pond Village, and the adjacent yet undeveloped portions of Truro, and it can provide safe access to and from Route 6 itself. It is the most practical of the three existing grade separations from Orleans to Provincetown as an entrance to the seashore.

Aside from this practical planning aspect of the area, if private and commercial developments continue to creep into this narrow, sparsely wooded portion of the proposed park area they will form an intrusion that could be seen for great distances from within the park. They would detract materially from the esthetics to be preserved, as well as from the safety and convenience of park developments at this point of entrance.

The Pamet and Little Pamet River Valleys should also be pointed out as areas of exceptional quality within the proposed National Seashore in Truro. Their scenery is outstanding, embracing some of the most rugged topography of the proposed area, and geologically they are significant as ancient glacial river valleys.

In addition to their natural features, the Pamet Valleys are rich historically in the portrayal of the early life and culture of Cape Cod. For protection against severe weather, early settlement of this part of the cape occurred in valleys, not on promontories as is often the case today. Within these valleys are approximately 27 pre-1850 homes, of interest also architectually as type specimens of the Cape Cod house and forming the cultural setting reiminiscent of a way of life fast disappearing on Cape Cod. These valleys lend themselves ideally to historic districts within the seashore to protect these picturesque dwellings and their setting.

The elimination of the Pamet Valleys from the seashore proposal would not only be a great loss of scenic, scientific and historical values but would also seriously impair the values of related areas, destroying the continuity and cohesiveness of the proposal and creating an impasse to the development of the park circulation system.

In Truro and Wellfleet, the proposed national seashore area extends across the cape to embrace a representative portion of the Cape Cod Bay shore. Here the proposed park has breadth enough to encompass a complex of natural features: heathlands and woodlands, marshes, and scenic uplands such as Griffin, Bound Brook and Merrick Islands. The area also includes the peninsula comprising Great Island, Great Beach Hill, and Jeremy Point, which aside from its scenic qualities, has a remote wilderness atmosphere that is perhaps unequaled elsewhere on the cape.

The islands, the marshes, the Herring River drainage and the Gull Pond chain of lakes, are all interrelated in a complex and interesting geologic and biologic story. Songbirds are numerous, and Duck Harbor is a favorite locality for waterfowl, especially Canada geese. The Herring River estuary is the only estuary within the proposal.

Historically, Bound Brook Island was the location of old Wellfleet. Although it is now united with the lower cape by marshes, these wetlands likewise isolate the island physiographically to form an ideal area for an historic district designation. Five pre-1850 homes remain on it. These include the old Higgins house, and the home of Alonzo Baker, a sea captain and founder of the United Fruit Co. Three more pre-1850 homes are located along Pamet Point Road which leads to Bound Brook Island from Route 6.

Griffin Island is of further importance because it forms a promontory overlooking the Herring River and Duck Harbor which offers excellent views over them and Cape Cod Bay. Griffin Island is the keystone which holds the proposal together in this central section of the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore.

This portion of the proposed national seashore which extends across from the ocean to Cape Cod Bay in Truro and Wellfleet also contains the largest cluster of fresh water ponds on the lower cape.

These glacial kettlehole ponds of Wellfleet and Truro compose one of the prime natural features of the seashore proposal. The ponds, created by the melting of buried ice remnants left by the glaciers, now form one of the most scenic areas on the cape.

Apart from their scenic and geologic importance, the kettlehole ponds are significant for their plant communities, which range from submerged aquatic plant beds through inkberry bush borders to pine-oak forest. There are four major types of fresh water ponds here. Some are drained, like the Gull, Higgins, Williams, and Herring Pond group, while others have no surface drainage, like those in the Great Pond-Long Pond complex. Some ponds are exposed to weather, while others are protected, and these conditions influence the plant communities.

Although the fish life of the ponds has been greatly altered, these waters have an invertebrate fauna of interest, and they are important for certain amphibians and for birds such as the pied-billed grebe, green-winged teal, blue-winged teal, wood duck, redhead duck, and others.

In southern Wellfleet and Eastham, the proposed national seashore area includes the broadest reach of upland forest land within the proposal and hence represents outstanding habitat for wildlife and opportunities for hiking and other outdoor activities conducive to appreciation of park values.

The Nauset marshes are outstanding for wildlife, particularly for migratory waterfowl. The area surrounding Salt Pond Bay is perhaps most typical of what one can call a classic Cape Cod scene. This particular vicinity is also noted for glacial features, such as the spectacular erratic boulder, Enos Rock. Salt Pond itself was at one time a fresh water glacial kettlehole pond. Salt Pond Bay and Salt Pond are surrounded by a belt of kames or conical bills of glacial origin. These were deposited along the south side of the Eastham Outwash Plain, formed between the lobes of the last advance of the ice.

A unique biological feature in this area are the red cedars invading old fields north of Salt Pond.

From a park planning standpoint, the area around Salt Pond and Salt Pond Bay is essential to a good pattern of park use. Depth is a requirement here not only for a proper introduction to the park but for control and dispersion of visitors.

Nauset Beach in Eastham, Orleans, and Chatham, is an outstanding natural feature of the proposed national seashore, offering many opportunities for park recreation. In Orleans the outstanding natural areas of Pochet, Sampson, and Hog Islands, are adjacent to this beach.

These islands are important because of their esthetic values, their relationship to the beach, the position they command in separating the wild beach from residential and other developments, and for scientific values not present elsewhere in the proposal. Their innate esthetic values in close relationship to Nauset Beach are in themselves compelling reasons for their inclusion in the proposal. They are virtually unmarred by manmade intrusions and their continued preservation and protection would assure the isolation and feeling of remoteness now experienced on Nauset Beach.

The geological significance of these islands presents a justification in itself for their inclusion in the proposal. These three islands are the only representative examples of the Sandwich Moraine in the proposed national seashore area, the last major glacial deposit formed on the cape in the great ice age.

Hog, Sampson, and Pochet Islands also contain important examples of ponds cut off from the sea by the formation of sandspits and salt marshes. Such ponds offer unusual opportunities for interpreting the forces of deposition and erosion and also of the plant and animal life which the formation of such ponds brings together.

Another island which is outstanding as a natural area is Morris Island in Chatham. Mr. Allen H. Morgan, executive vice president of the Massachusetts Audubon Society, has stated that Morris Island is, acre for acre, the most important emergency bird resting and feeding area on the New England coast, and one of the top two or three such emergency habitats for migrating land birds on the entire Atlantic seaboard. Morris Island, closely related geographically to Monomoy Island, but of glacial rather than postglacial origin as is Monomoy, is also biologically important for the rare white cedar bog it contains as well as for a stand of beeches, and value as a wild scenic area.

Since the natural character of Cape Cod is compounded of many elements and since these occur in different proportions in different areas, Cape Cod is not a uniform scene. Therefore, to excise large chunks of territory from the proposed national seashore would alter its balance of park features, and would also dismember it geographically so drastically as to severely impair its usefulness as an area devoted to preserving and exhibiting the natural and historic features of Cape Cod. To remove such key areas, for instance, as Morris Island, the woodlands and lands around Salt Pond Bay, the ponds region, Griffin, Bound Brook, and Great Islands, the valleys of Truro or the woodlands of the province lands would so severely damage its quality and its benefit to the cape and to the Nation in preserving the Cape Cod scene that the national significance of the remaining area would be questionable.

It would also impair its cohesiveness as an administrable area by so constricting and fragmenting it that park routes and facilities could not be developed adequately in the best interests of park conservation and public use. To thus hamper proper park planning would tend to increase the impact of public use upon the traditional atmosphere of the cape.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will try to mention some of the important points of Mr. Wirth's statement in which he tried to put this project into proper perspective. I would like to mention the fact that, with donated funds, the Park Service has made a survey of the seashore of the United States to try to identify the best sections to preserve for public use and enjoyment.

Out of 180 areas which we regard to be primarily of local, State and National park significance we found only 10 that we thought would measure up as areas of national significance, the kind of areas which, because of their values in relation to the other areas that we surveyed, the kinds of areas that people would be justified in traveling from any part of the United States to see, they would be justified in supporting whether the people live here in Massachusetts or whether their tax dollars came from some western State.

The Cape Cod area is one of those 10. It is an exceptional area, as you all know. I will not take your time on that.

I would like to say, however, a word about the boundaries, since there has been much discussion of the boundaries.

When we started our more detailed studies of the cape, following the general seashore survey, our effort was to try to locate the minimum area of land—that is, to identify the minimum area of land that would have a cross section of the best of the park-type values remaining here on the lower cape. We considered the scenic qualities; we considered the recreational utility; we considered the historic attractions and historic values; the natural history values of forests, marsh, beach, swamp, and so on. We considered the geological values. All of these elements have been included and reported upon in this report which is available to the committee. That report was briefed in this smaller brochure and that is available, too, to the committee.

The report of the eastern seashore survey which identified Cape Cod as one of the outstanding areas is "Our Vanishing Shoreline," with which I think you are all familiar and that is available to the committee.

When you look at the area as proposed, it is about one-eighth of the area of Cape Cod. It is smaller than any existing national park with the exception of the Virgin Islands, Platt, and Hot Springs, I believe. The proposed area is about 32,000 acres, including Monomoy Island. Within that relatively small area and skirting the long established villages, you have such places as the province lands with their forests—the dwarf forests to be sure, but they are very attractive—their marshes and exceptional sand dunes.

In the Truro area you have historic sites, particularly the Pilgrim Spring area, the old historic villages of the Pamet River Valley and historic houses over on the bayshore side. There is the beginning of the high bluffs, which are exceptional on the cape, and the heath land on the bayside and the kettle holes left from the glaciers.

Next to that, you come into Wellfleet with the pond and lake country which is one of the loveliest and most delightful parts of the cape. There is also the Herring River Valley, with its marshes, both fresh and salt water, that drain some of those lakes. There are the more remote areas of Great Island and down to Jeremy Point. There is also the historic site of Bound Brook Island and the fine relatively undeveloped area of Griffin Island, which gives some of the finest views both up and down the cape and as far as Provincetown and over the wide part of the proposed park.

In drawing the boundary of the park, we tried to include a cross section of the cape, where it would give both the variety and the scenes of the oceanside and those of the bayside. That, of course, is in the Truro and the Wellfleet area, which has been discussed much today. We limited that as much as we possibly could, we thought, and still have a unit that was capable of being protected and managed, and within which people might move around with safety and get a park experience.

There has to be some continuity of an area and unity to its development program in order to achieve that end. The end was to both preserve an outstanding area and to make it useful to the public as a park.

In doing this, we also took careful pains to leave out the developed villages and that, of course, is shown in the map. Studies of growth potential have been made as a part of our planning survey and we are of the opinion, as a result of these studies, that there is about as much land left for development within the four lower cape towns outside of the park as has been developed and is now in developed state, after 300 years of occupancy.

The way we got at that was to take the very latest aerial photographs of the cape which show the development. We measured off the developed lands, we subtracted the swamp area, the marshes. We then took the undeveloped or partially developed land and arbitrarily assigned a figure of at least 3 acres for each building and multiplied that by the number of buildings. That gave us for Provincetown some 450 acres outside of the proposed park and exclusive of marshland, exclusive of developed land, for future development and growth. It gave the figure of about 2,000 acres for growth in the town of Truro. It gave a figure of 2,500 acres for growth and development in the town of Wellfleet and 2,800 acres in Eastham.

Now, the bill that we are considering here has a number of exceptional provisions to protect both the property owners and the communities here on the cape. There has been very little discussion of those today. It is late, and I am not going to take the time to enumerate them as they are enumerated in the Director's statement. I merely mention them, however, because I think the bill is exceptional in the protection that it gives the property owners in the proposed seashore area.

In regard to the economic question that has come up today, mention has been made many times of the economic study of the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore, copies of which are available to the committee. On page 70 of this report, several alternative possibilities are considered as steps in the acquisition of land for the park in the event it should be authorized.

If all of the undeveloped land within the proposed park in the town of Chatham were acquired immediately, and there were no compensating effects from the park, taxes might go up 6 cents on the thousand per year. The same in Eastham, where the taxes might go up as much as 80 cents on the thousand. In Orleans the figures were too small, and likewise in Provincetown. In Truro, if all of the undeveloped land were acquired immediately, taxes might go up as much as $2.70. In Wellfleet, if all lands were acquired immediately, taxes might go up as much as $1.97.

The report goes on to point out, however, that with the increased visitation to the cape which is bound to come about as a result of a conservation project of this sort, that in the first few years after the establishment of the park it is estimated that at least $30 million worth of service structures and facilities for visitors would be required; counting those, the major portion of which would be provided by private enterprise outside of the park, but including also Government development within the park.

I think it is quite reasonable to hold that with that kind of economic growth outside of the park in service industries taking care of the visitors, that those relatively small tax increases that were predicted, if all of the undeveloped land were acquired immediately, which is not likely—more time would be given—but, in any event, the economic growth as a result of the park would surely more than compensate for the relatively small increase in taxes.

Now, only one other point, and then I am through. There has been much discussion of the kind of development within the park and of tenting in particular. We do not feel that the national parks are established to provide camping areas. Camping is provided in the parks only to the extent that it is necessary to camp there to enjoy them or to use them.

In historic parks, for instance, there is no camping; there is not even picknicking in historic parks. We don't know the amount of camping that would absolutely be required in the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore. Perhaps none, but perhaps some. In any event, camping was not the primary objective in proposing the seashore; it was a conservation objective.

With regard to Morris Island, I feel quite confident that that would never be used as a campground, if that is retained in the park. It is too fine a natural and wild area. Obviously, campgrounds do not belong around the ponds or in historic areas either. The camping is an issue which, I believe, perhaps has caused greater fears than is justified. The camping we believe could very well be taken care of for the most part elsewhere.

I think those are the only points I wish to bring up at this time in the direct statement.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you very much, Mr. Thompson.

Did I understand you correctly to say that in planning the seashore legislation, you evaluated the number of acres in improvements in each one of the towns and set aside—that is, excluded from the park boundaries—an equal number of acres for future expansion?

Mr. THOMPSON. If I gave that impression, Mrs. Pfost, that was not what I intended to do. What I intended to say was that after we had made our study of what was needed for a park and then computed the developed land left outside in the towns, it was apparent that there was at least as much undeveloped space in these four towns outside of the proposed park left for growth as had been utilized in those towns outside the park in the 300 years of occupancy.

Mrs. PFOST. Could you tell us the four towns you have in mind, please?

Mr. THOMPSON. Provincetown, Truro, Wellfleet, and Eastham.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you.

The gentleman from Oregon, Mr. Ullman.

Mr. ULLMAN. I know there are a number of questions the people here have in mind about the possible procedures that would be involved under the legislation before us. First, the matter of inheritance. Specifically, what is the provision with respect to inheritance for the property that is in ownership within the boundaries of the proposed park?

Mr. THOMPSON. Until it is purchased for park purposes, the inheritance would not be affected in any way. The bill would authorize the sale of property for park purposes subject either to 25-year lease or for lifetime, or for the lifetime of either of a married couple or for the lifetime of their youngest child up to 21 years of age, which is comparable to that in the Oregon Dunes bill, as you will recognize.

Mr. ULLMAN. In other words, if parents with a 3-year-old child owned the property, then it became a park, they could take a lifetime ownership and as long as that 3-year-old child lived the property could remain in their ownership; is that right?

Mr. THOMPSON. As I understand it, Mr. Congressman, that would remain in their ownership as long as they lived or for 25 years, or until the youngest child was 21 years of age. There were three alternatives which could be selected by the vendor.

Mr. ULLMAN. In other words, probably the maximum that the property could be held would be the lifetime of the existing owners. If the ownership was in the hands of children, at the time the park was developed, then it would remain with them throughout their lifetime.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. ULLMAN. What about concessions in the park? We find a fear here among some of the people that the park will establish business concessions or a hotel, or a barroom concession of one kind or another. What is the policy of the Park Service and what would be your policy here?

Mr. THOMPSON. We stated in questions and answers which have been rather widely distributed on the cape here, that we would expect all facilities to serve the public, overnight accommodations, meals, garage, that sort of thing, to be provided by people outside of the park. Now, if there should be a motel or a hotel within the park, then the bill would authorize the Secretary to give a permit for the continuation of that, if it served park people.

Mr. ULLMAN. That is for existing commercial developments?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. ULLMAN. But you would anticipate no new commercial establishment or concessions within the boundaries of the park?

Mr. THOMPSON. That is right.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. I think the people on the beach are going to want to get some food, say hot dogs, some time during the day. They cannot go all the way to the town centers to get some kind of lunch or a bottle of pop. I do not see how you are going to run the seashore without some concessions.

Mr. THOMPSON. We may have to, but the intention is to have the meals, the overnight accommodations, the car services, in fact, all of the ordinary services for visitors provided as much as possible outside of the park, as it is in Great Smokey Mountains, for instance.

Mr. RIVERS. But, just nominal or minor service on the beach.

Mr. THOMPSON. That might be necessary.

Mr. RIVERS. I should think it would be. Let us admit it, you would have to provide for sale of pop and hot dogs, for example, if people are going to spend the day on the beach with children.

Mr. ULLMAN. And we can anticipate with the number of people coming to the park, that the need for overnight facilities, restaurants, and other services in the areas outside of the park would be vastly increased because of the park population. Would you anticipate that would be true, Mr. Thompson?

Mr. THOMPSON. We would. The economic report so anticipates, too.

Mr. ULLMAN. The report anticipates that also?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. ULLMAN. We could expect considerable investment?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. ULLMAN. Private investment on the private area on the cape as a result of the establishment of a park?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. ULLMAN. Turning to Morris Island, supposing this were left as it is and not included in the boundaries, is there any way of requiring conservation of, for instance, the white cedar swamps and the other areas of particular natural significance on the island?

Mr. THOMPSON. I suppose that such an area could be described and included in the bill. The white cedar swamps, for instance, is not, as we were told by Mr. McNeece yesterday, included in their development plan. For development, I mean.

Mr. ULLMAN. In other words, it would be possible to take a portion of the island and include it, but you cannot see any other way of guaranteeing the preservation and continued conservation of those nondeveloped areas?

Mr. THOMPSON. It seems to me that including the area in the park for conservation would be the surest way for the future to guarantee protection for all times.

Mr. ULLMAN. Thank you.

That is all, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. PFOST. The gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Thompson, you have heard the witnesses today from the different towns who in a way expressed general approval of the proposal, but with the reservation that they do not want certain land included in their respective towns. What is your attitude toward their proposition? There would have to be some give and take, perhaps, in the boundaries.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chenoweth, I think we are quite sympathetic to the problems that have been expressed here and the problems of the people on the cape. At the same time, when you try to plan a national reservation of this sort, which people are going to visit and come to from all over the United States, I believe that we have to see that point of view as well as the point of view of each of the towns.

It was our feeling that the boundaries that we had proposed was the minimum that ought to be considered for a national seashore and it is also our feeling that the proposed exclusion would seriously impair the value of the seashore as a conservation device, and would seriously impair its effectiveness from the public use angle. In other words, these exclusions would hurt it very badly, in our opinion.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I have the impression, Mr. Thompson, that Mr. Wirth has indicated a willingness to sit down and talk to these different groups, rather than just take an arbitrary position, in which there would be no compromise or no yielding of any kind. I am curious to know what your attitude is. This is a very important situation here, and it is a very serious problem. The economy of this area is affected. They are very much concerned.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes. Mr. Wirth has been here to the cape several times and has discussed the proposal before a good many hundreds of people and he has discussed it with smaller groups, and with some of the selectmen, too.

We don't wish to be arbitrary about the matter, and I hope that I am not being arbitrary in presenting this plan, which was the result of our studies. It was our honest opinion, and still is, that that was the best boundary that we could recommend, considering all of the circumstances—the park needs on the one hand and the fact that the Cape is a long established area with communities and property owners, on the other.

Mr. CHENOWETH. In the event that Congress would see fit to change these boundaries, what would your position be? Would you feel we had destroyed the project, and its desirability, or would you go along?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think that these proposed exclusions, if these areas were left out of the park, would seriously damage the park.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The proposals then made to the committee today, would destroy, you think, the desirability of the project?

Mr. THOMPSON. It would greatly impair it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You would not want to tell the committee that the doors are closed to these people, that they have no recourse now to present their case?

Mr. THOMPSON. No, no, certainly not. The decision is not ours. But I think that we owe it to you and to the people of the Cape to tell you what our opinion is as a result of our studies.

Mr. CHENOWETH. And that is, you feel, the irreducible opinion?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes; we think this is the best boundary.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That you could recommend to the Congress?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHENOWETH. As a feasible project?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Thank you, Madam Chairman. That is all.

Mrs. PFOST. The gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. RIVERS. I would like to mention again hotdogs and bottles of pop. I was not being critical whatsoever. But just for the record, I insist on being practical. I did not want the record to show that you were not going to put any concession in the park where I could visualize the need for some minor service of the kind that I mentioned. That was my only purpose, and for the record, because later on that might come back to haunt you, if you did put in concessions for minor services.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it is a good point, and I have been to some of the town beaches here where just that kind of service is provided and it is very useful.

Mr. RIVERS. And I agree with you in not putting resort hotels within the park and all of that, letting the communities provide the principal services.

I would like to refer to Provincetown. You spoke of room for expansion at Provincetown. A previous witness spoke about the land presently within the jurisdiction of Provincetown being completely used but that there were the province lands nearby that were unused and that perhaps some of it could be made available from the State of Massachusetts. When you drew your line on your proposed boundary, did you draw it through this province lands area in such a way that if Provincetown can make arrangements with the State, there would be some acreage outside of the park still next door to Provincetown for future development or expansion?

Mr. THOMPSON. The line followed the line of the province lands and also included the lands that the State had authorized for acquisition for State park purposes.

Mr. RIVERS. Of course, that does not quite illuminate the matter for me as I just got a look at the area. You are not leaving any land presently within Provincetown for future development. Are you asking for all of that property?

Mr. THOMPSON. Our line included all of the province lands.

Mr. RIVERS. It did?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. Then there is a conflict in the testimony because I think Mr. Snow said that aside from getting some acreage in the future for expansion of Provincetown from the State, which would be a portion of the province lands, that they just had no place to go and perhaps that can be cleared up.

Thank you.

Mrs. PFOST. Is it not true, according to Mr. Snow's statement, that the additional land is in State ownership at this time, Mr. Rivers, and that is why they have no place to go at the moment until this suit is litigated?

Mr. RIVERS. No. Until their negotiations are completed, perhaps you mean.

Mrs. PFOST. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. What I was trying to bring out was that the State-owned land is the so-called province lands, and if the Park Service is drawing a line around the entire province lands and is going to ask the State for all the province lands, I cannot discover where the remaining land is for Provincetown to expand in.

Mr. THOMPSON. It was private land outside of the province lands.

Mr. RIVERS. Private land outside to expand on?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes. I am sorry I misunderstood your question.

Mr. RIVERS. I still see the conflict in the testimony.

Mrs. PFOST. Are there further questions of Mr. Thompson?

Thank you very much, gentlemen. We appreciate your testimony.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. PFOST. Our next group of witnesses is Heaton Vorse, Provincetown and Mary Cecil Allen, Green Bushes, 24 Race Road, Provincetown.

While this group is coming to the witness stand, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have placed in the record the wire which was received today from Congressman Edward Boland, who favors the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore and who was an original sponsor of the bill, and a statement by Congressman Thomas Lane, who also favors establishment of the park, and Congressman Silvio O. Conte, who also favors the establishment of the park.

Without objection, these statements will be placed in the record in full. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. PFOST. Are Mr. Vorse and Miss Allen here? You people may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HEATON VORSE, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mr. VORSE. My name is Heaton Vorse. I am the son of Mary Heaton Vorse, who is also making a presentation before this committee. Like my mother, I am a writer and a journalist. At present, I do a column for the Provincetown New Beacon. I grew up in Provincetown and went to grade and high school there. Much of my adult life has been spent in Provincetown. I know it well.

I oppose any change of the proposed boundaries of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park within the township of Provincetown for two reasons.

Most of the territory which is to form the cape tip section of the park is province lands. I have been over much of this area on foot. It is composed of marshland, both salt and fresh, and steep hills of soft, shifting sand, sometimes covered by a layer of humus never more than 2 inches thick on which scrub vegetation grows. There are few places on the province lands where it is feasible to build a house of any sort. When the land is level enough to build on, it is wet. When the land is dry, it is practically vertical. All of it is made up basically of unstable sand, quite unsuitable to build on, but very good park land. It is park land now, and should remain so.

My second reason is that Provincetown has no need for new land to expand in as it has already just about reached the economic limit of its water supply. There is plenty of water in Provincetown, but it contains so many salts in solution and carries so much organic material that it must be heavily treated and strongly filtered before it can be made fit for human consumption.

A second difficulty is that the water table is so close to that of sea level that a sharp drain on any one well within the boundaries of the township soon strike salt.

For this reason, Provincetown went to Truro for its water supply as early as 1907. But, even in Truro it is possible to strike salt and by 1924, the original wells had done so, and new ones had to be dug.

By 1950, the town needed more water. Surveys by Whitman and Howard to find potable water in sufficient quantities within Provincetown failed. Truro had to be tapped again and 7½ more miles of water main had to be laid to bring the water in. The new plant went into operation in 1954.

Should Provincetown expand and need still more water, it will have to go expensively farther and farther up the cape to get it. I doubt if this is economically feasible. It would be better for the town to be content to remain within its present boundaries and let the province lands be taken over from the State of Massachusetts by the Cape Cod Seashore National Park.

Thank you.

Mrs. PFOST. Mary Cecil Allen, please.

STATEMENT OF MARY CECIL ALLEN, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Miss Allen. Madam Chairman and members, my name is Mary Cecil Allen. I am an Australian artist who came to Provincetown 12 years ago. I have been a property owner there for the last 8 years. My remarks will apply primarily to the park as it concerns Provincetown. I want to express myself as wholeheartedly in favor of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park, without boundary retrenchments, and as outlined in the bills introduced in Congress in September 1959.

I was in Australia last winter, and I was amazed to find how closely Australia was following the progress of conservation in the United States. In Melbourne, my hometown, the most desirable land for real estate and commercial development along the banks of the Yarra River, on which Melbourne is built, has been set aside by the State of Victoria to remain in its original state with eucalyptus, wattle, and other native trees. Similar restrictions have been made all over Victoria, as well as in the five other States in the Commonwealth.

I feel that if, in the name of town expansion and commercial development, the proposed park is bisected and retrenched by cutting our portions of the province lands, the whole aspect and meaning of a national park will be thwarted and destroyed.

I also feel that the interests of Provincetown as regards prosperity will be amply served by the park itself, through the added attraction for tourists which the park will provide. And here I would like to say that expensive hotels, motels, and restaurants built in the province lands, should they be acquired by the town, would be of no use to most of the tourists who would use the park. For Provincetown's summer accommodation has become so expensive in the last few years that more of the same kind of accommodations would benefit only the rich, and not the people for whom the park aims at providing a more or less inexpensive vacation, so that they, too, can enjoy the air, the ocean, the beauty of the wild scenery.

Again, if the province lands should be used for commercial purposes, and if outside promotional interests are solicited and brought in with the idea that they will expand and develop the town and thereby be of benefit to it, I submit that the actual result will be that these interests will largely take their summer earnings out of town. This is already the case with many of the businesses attracted to Provincetown by its great influx of summer visitors. These businesses go to Florida and elsewhere for the winter and only come to Provincetown for the short lucrative summer season.

I would like to make the point that the true prosperity of at least Provincetown lies in the power to attract a larger residential and property owning population, who would deal at the local stores, pay taxes, and outstay the summer visitors, often by as much as 3 months and in some cases by the whole winter.

The local stores would be encouraged to stay open more and more in the winter, if there were a larger resident population. There are already signs of this. Within the last 4 years, artists have been buying or building houses in Provincetown at a greater rate than ever before. These artists are staying later in the year and returning at holiday times. The principal houses on the waterfront and many in the interior of the town are now owned by artists. Now of late, these artists are becoming more and more concerned and alarmed about the possible disappearance, through shortsighted commercialism, of the very features which have led them to settle and acquire property on the cape.

I know today the point has been made by some of the speakers that one does not have perhaps a right to speak on these things unless one has lived for 300 years on the cape. But since Provincetown does not appear to be able to provide indigenous artists, Provincetown, summer capital of art in the United States, has to rely on artists coming in from elsewhere.

The real assets of Provincetown and the rest of the cape are bound up with their unique natural surroundings and unspoiled coastal scenery. These, and to a great extent, these alone, are the attractions which now bring so many summer tourists and visitors; not hotels, restaurants, parking lots, and gift shops, but the opportunity to come into contact with a life so removed from that of large towns and cities, that it is, day by day, becoming rarer and harder for the ordinary man and woman to experience.

It is this natural beauty and this wild coastal scenery that a national park, without crippling boundary modifications' as outlined in the bills placed before the Congress in September 1959, would preserve, not only to Provincetown, but to the people of the United States forever.

I wish to thank this congressional committee for permitting me to give my views. [Applause.]

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions of either Miss Allen or Mr. Vorse?

Thank you very much.

Our next witness will be Mr. Serge Chermayeff, professor of architecture, Harvard University.

STATEMENT OF SERGE CHERMAYEFF, PROFESSOR OF ARCHITECTURE, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chermayeff. Madam Chairman, I am thankful for your indulgence, because I know I was not scheduled to appear at this time. I am starting to run a fever and I started it, I assure you, at 7 o'clock this morning, and not about midday. I want to keep as much as I can to the purpose of this inquiry. But it is necessary, because some points were raised earlier, for me to comment on part of these hearings.

I am appearing before you so to speak in a treble capacity: one, as a Truro resident; two, as a professional planner, and, thirdly, as a do-gooder. I want to make quite sure that my position in this matter is understood by your committee.

As a resident, I am absolutely sure that the large proportion of taxpaying residents in Wellfleet and Truro are not represented in the recommendations which have been placed before you. It is a curious situation in which I have to be flattered, by undue attention, given half the time of an important selectman witness to what was obviously an attempt to discredit a witness in advance of his appearance.

I assure you that I have absolutely no personal ax to grind. As a resident, I have watched the disintegration of the cape and I am sure you are all aware that any kind of further delay will mean that the developers which are championing the authority and legality of the retroactive clause in the act may prove to Mr. Thompson's horror to be so devastating that the bill will be nothing but so many words, unless action is taken very, very quickly.

If anything which was said in the letters cited earlier today is fundamentally incorrect, either in detail or in substance, I will, of course, make any corrections necessary as and when these errors are proved. In the meantime, I am offering these letters as part of my testimony today for the record of your committee, and I am sure that you can find all the evidence of accuracy or inaccuracy that you may wish to ascertain.

I do not think I have to apologize today for being a professor. In fact, there is a gentleman who is seeking more and more advice at this moment and seeking more and more advice from professors, who has had more responsibility than the selectman from Wellfleet.

I think if Representative Keith had sought to meet and learn the views of some of the proponents of the park—of course, you have declared yourself as a backer of the park, but since an opponent of its original intention—I think, Representative, you would have had other views presented to you than those which you chose to hear, which were by the opponents of the park.

For instance, if we look at the map which is presented today, which apparently Congressman Keith is in agreement with, it becomes apparent that Mr. Thompson's evidence is really very important indeed.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chermayeff, we would prefer that you keep your remarks to the legislation, rather than to the individuals who have actually——

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. I am coming to that, if you will excuse me.

Mrs. PFOST. All right.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. This is a necessary introduction because the point that has been made in relation to conservation, which is really the great issue of the legislation, is quite simple.

If you look at the map of the proposed deletions from the park, it would be quite impossible to get anything in the way of conservation into so small an area of land. Conservation would then be just a word. It would not have any serious meaning because the ecology of wildlife cannot jump quarter mile gaps with residents, their pets and cars and so on. The pockets which are proposed, furthermore, in the single area, on a point made by Mr. Thompson, which is the largest single area and most conforms to the true pleasures and purposes of a park area. So to take the largest area and then to carve it up would indeed be to destroy the potential conservation of the park as intended by the bill.

There is the issue also, of course, of the conservation of towns. Their anxieties, I think, are very well founded in some respects and I suspect that minor adjustments in fringe boundaries could, as a matter of fact, be usefully made.

But the provisions of the pockets within the park area would, of course, create endless conflicts administratively, from the point of view of access and control between the three people who would be involved: the park, the township and the private owner.

I would, finally, like to say again as a planner, an architect, something further on the potential of the town. It has already been partially touched on.

The small scattering of houses on acre-up lots which sounds so attractive and so undisturbing, as a matter of fact, does not quite work out that way. A road goes just as far if it feeds 6 houses as if the road feeds 12 houses in the same frontage. So that in the end, what would happen is that the low density proposed, the kind of scattering of houses in the woods on these large lots, would make the towns run short of land very soon. They would want more land because this is a most uneconomic way of using land, and it is most unproductive to the towns, because these remote and scattered taxpayers require proportionately greater service than the more compact township.

We have made some preliminary studies in order to put these contentions to a test. There is ample room, for instance, in Wellfleet, which as a town, has historic value and a new harbor actually created by Selectman Frazier's energetic procedure. Both of these may be developed within the existing boundaries of the town, more residential area could be gotten and in fact the population of Wellfleet and its economy could treble and quadruple without any extension of land whatsoever.

I would like, if I may, without trespassing further on your time, because I have put these documents in, just merely to quote quickly from what I did write down.

The fact of accessibility to the cape, the great highway system, means that not only is the cape generally accessible, but it is accessible in less time. The meaning of this is that the cape really has only two alternate choices. It either becomes a partly controlled resort area with very closely knit development, or it will, in fact, become a dormitory suburb for industry on Route 128, which is within 5 minutes' commuting time from the cape. This is clearly the choice and much as I sympathize with the nostalgia for the immovable past, I know that the cape has to make a decision at this moment and the decision may not be postponed much longer.

Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

(Mr. Chermayeff's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF SERGE CHERMAYEFF, PROFESSOR OF ARCHITECTURE, HARVARD UNIVERSITY

I am appearing before this committee in a dual role: first as a resident in Truro during the last 18 years and, second, as a professional and member of the faculty of the Graduate School of Design in Harvard, which contains regional and city planning, landscape architecture, and architecture.

I do not wish to trespass on your time by discussing again general points in connection with the bills for the establishment of a Cape Cod National Park. These have been amply aired.

If it is in order, may my testimony before the Senate committee at Eastham now on record be made part of my testimony today. Also the testimony I offered both at the House of Representatives and Senate committee hearings in Washington, D.C., this year (appendix 1).

Your committee should know what has been happening since the park proposals have been made. I hope that you may have seen at first hand some of the depredation the cape has suffered during this time.

The cape now stands in danger of being destroyed by unscrupulous and cynical developers more rapidly than ever, paradoxically as a direct result of the Cape Cod Park proposal.

I wrote to Congressman Wayne N. Aspinall on August 8, 1960, following the Washington hearings in June. Nothing being presented at these hearings changes the view I then expressed in respect to boundaries, and I ask for this letter to be made part of my testimony today (appendix 2).

The acceleration of depredation of the designated park area was such that I wrote to Chairman Aspinall again on November 21, 1960, and reported specific acts which amounted to a challenge to the legality of the retroactive clause in the bills as drafted. I ask that this letter also be included as part of my testimony today (appendix 3), with the following corrections:

Page 2, item 2: Mr. Halperin has since informed me that the unimproved land in question was for two houses for their own use by two families, but that the purchase was not made. The price asked for 5 acres was $18,000.

Page 2, item 3: Mr. Walling broke ground this November for two houses (one under construction) for rent or sale.

Page 2, item 4: The Duarte acreage off which top soil was stripped and sold is closer to 200 than 100 acres.

As a footnote I might add to this item: When Mr. Duarte, the developer, sold the top soil to a contractor, Mr. Duarte, the member of the planning board, sold the town of Truro down the river.

I should like to add something further to the point on conservation and recreation: Many people who are otherwise proponents of the park have expressed fears as to the nature and extent of recreation facilities to be provided.

There is no doubt that this issue is a problem peculiar to the cape. The Department of Interior's provisional policy statement issued in March last in response to letters from Senators Kennedy and Saltonstall, would, I believe, be much strengthened and well wishers be reassured, if the emphasis on conservation was less equivocal than presently stated in the bill.

I respectfully offer an amendment to section 8: that subsection (b) (1) be revised to read as follows:

"The park shall be permanently preserved as a primitive wilderness, and no development of the park or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken by the Secretary which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing in the area described in section 1 of this Act or with the preservation of such historic sites and structures as he may designate. Where such development does not interfere with the objectives of conservation, the Secretary may develop for appropriate public uses such portions of Cape Cod National Seashore Park as he deems especially adaptable for such uses, including swimming, boating, sailing, hunting, fishing, hiking, the appreciation of historic sites and structures and natural features of Cape Cod, and other recreational activities of similar nature."

May I summarize briefly the points of greatest urgency, for we are beyond the 11th hour.

1. Means must be found to prevent further spoliation of the designated park area pending legislation, if the declared intentions of the bill are to be more than just words. A precedent for such action may perhaps be found in other national park situations. In any case a speedy passing of the bills cannot be urged sufficiently.
2. The park area must on no account be trimmed down. If anything, it should be increased to protect great views of dunes and estuaries.
3. The Mid-Cape Highway should, as far as possible, be within the park.
4. No pockets of land under town jurisdiction should be permitted within the park area. These will destroy conservation measures and create insuperable conflicts between the interests and controls of the park, the town, and the interim period residents.

The areas proposed for exclusion will not benefit the towns; they will merely provide fat profits for the owners of this unimproved land.

The interim bona fide residents within the park area have ample protection under the bill. The towns have ample opportunity for expansion within approximately the designated boundaries.

Preliminary studies made show unequivocally that with proper planning the towns have nothing to fear and everything to gain if they pull their economy off the highway, where cape visitors' money is collected during the summer to be spent elsewhere, and out of the woods, where it is relatively unproductive and expensive to the towns.

5. A master plan should be encouraged and financial aid provided for this purpose, for the cape as a whole with special reference to the lower cape.

The lower towns must be encouraged to conserve, improve, and develop what they have as town entities, as in the case of Provincetown and Wellfleet, or to develop actual town nuclei, as in the case of Truro and Eastham.

In any case the towns should recognize that they have a potential all-year-round economy as the result of the cape's new accessibility.

In closing may I suggest the cape has only two alternatives:

First is to continue to be exploited by real estate developers who know full well its future promising to themselves alone. The cape as we know it will vanish forever within a decade and be replaced by an endless suburban sprawl, a dormitory for Route 128 industries within 45 minutes commuting time.

Second, to be a great natural asset for the Nation, together with towns which are both historically valued and which could further be constantly enjoyed as resort towns of special character and small scale.

Appendix 1

Summary of Testimony of Serge Chermayeff

Since the Cape Cod National Park hearings at Eastham in December, I believe some subsequent observations can be usefully brought before the congressional committees at this time.

I offer these as matters of emphasis rather than necessarily new points.

1. In spite of provisions to make the proposed bill retroactive to September 1959, a great deal of house building has been "rushed" this winter within the designated park area. By no means all of this is for owner occupancy. To my knowledge some has been deliberately constructed for commercial purposes (i.e., for summer rent).

2. The above, almost overtly a challenge to the legality of the retroactive provision, is, I believe, a reflection of organized opposition to the park—organized in the sense that very vocal, active, and influential groups led by Mr. Nickerson and Selectman Frazier have been exploiting the uncertainties and delays since that time.

3. It has become quite obvious to this witness since the Eastham hearings that the opposition has abandoned any genuine intention of a compromise with the long-term public spirited objectives of the park, and is in fact filibustering the park out with the assistance of a local minority whose objectives are entirely self-centered and short term, and which can be properly described as a real estate lobby reluctant to miss a killing on property cheaply acquired.

4. The general climate of opinion and view of action taken, readily seen and felt by anyone spending their time regularly within the designated park area, makes the action more urgent than ever. All delay permits the erosion of the resources scheduled for conservation at an ever increasing rate and the retroactive clause is legally weak, threatens to immeasurably increase the cost of acquisition.

5. It is my particular wish to emphasize two aspects of the park proposals discussed in my previous testimony:

i. That the most serious consideration be given to the clarification and provide separation of the issues of conservation on the one hand and public recreation on the other. The latter should perhaps be unequivocably be limited to the great beaches and possibly gull ponds. The "pond public recreation facilities" will in dimensions alone prove difficult to control and continue in what, it must be emphasized again and again, is a very small terrain indeed.

ii. The same consideration of limitation considered with the need, both of conservation in the park area, as well as conservation implied in so many statements of Cape Codders concerned with preserving the amenities of the lower cape townships in their present "villagish" "uncommercial" and charming form.

The Harvard Graduate School of Design study of Wellfleet makes it clear that in the interests of both the park and the townships, Route 6 should be within the park. Such a provision, coupled with wise zoning regulations, based upon intelligent master planning could guarantee the useful coexistence of both park and town within the physically limited area of the cape.

I urge further that purely quantitative and arbitrary provisions should now be abandoned and specific carefully considered planning issues be defined. A characteristic administrative absurdity is the Wellfleet selectman's proposal for an area for exclusion which on the north coincides with the Wellfleet-Truro line—utterly irrelevant to geography, topography, and good sense.

Having no reason to change my mind on the major points offered at the local hearings, I respectfully submit the material contained in appendixes 1, 2, and 3 of my testimony before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, pages 194–199 to the congressional committees at this time.

APPENDIX 2

AUGUST 5, 1960.

Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: I am taking the liberty of addressing you directly on the issue of the Cape Cod National Seashore because the larger part of the evidence presented at hearings held to date has been directed by the opponents of the park.

Unfortunately, in some instances private interest pleaded the opposition's cause under the guise of concern for public good.

This was the case in Wellfleet and Truro. I live on the town line between the two and have firsthand experience of what has been going on ever since the park proposal was made known.

The well-organized opposition concentrated its arguments on details and deliberately ignored the provisions and safeguards of the bills in respect to these, but above all it ignored cynically the basic aim of the national seashore, namely conservation.

Selectmen's proposals, which include the withholding of large areas of historic interest in the heart of the proposed park, such as Thoreau's Cape around Gull Pond in Wellfleet, do not have the support of the majority of established house owners in this area. Most of us feel amply protected by provisions of the bill. These proposals have been put forward by owners of unimproved land looking for spectacular profits or by builders of summer rent shacks erected since September 30, 1959, dateline provided in the bill.

Compromise boundaries discussed between selectmen and Congressman Keith in fact have little justification either from the point of view of residents in the area or from the point of view of the public interest at large.

The area originally proposed is on the whole a most reasonable one, even if some modest adjustments in a few particulars require to be made on the periphery.

As a professional planner I respectfully submit the following points for the most serious attention of Congress:

(1) The eventual conservation of the largest possible area without pockets of a heavily populated kind within the conservation area, already very small and ecologically speaking vulnerable. It should be noted that conservationwise the most promising portion is the full cape width between Truro and Wellfleet.

(2) The concentration of recreation facilities involving traffic and crowds to a strictly limited number of beachheads, which provide in any case the overwhelmingly largest portion of the cope's attractions.

(3) The placing of the Cape Cod Highway within the park area, with the consequent preservation of cape scenery for the visitors to enjoy: the vast majority of whom come by car.

(4) The containment of the lower cape townships in strictly defined boundaries which might convince them to plan the proper use of their ample resources; ample for an expansion of their economy and population, and the preservation of their character.

The town boundaries proposed under the bill, with minor adjustments, more than suffice to meet the needs of the foreseeable future, if the present fashion for small house scattering with eroding effect is replaced by a more appropriate concentrated planning related directly to the national seashore bill.

(5) To urge that the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore be linked to master planning of the lower cape as a whole. The lower cape presents an opportunity for the development of conservation and economic growth simultaneously which may prove to be typical of other situations which will inevitably arise in many parts of the United States in the immediate future.

The cape presents a wonderful opportunity for a demonstration. It would be tragic if it were to be missed, for the losers will be not only the people of the United States but the Cape Codders themselves.

Respectfully yours,

SERGE CHERMAYEFF,
Professor, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University.

APPENDIX 3

NOVEMBER 21, 1960.

Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: I wrote you with regard to the Cape Cod National Seashore on August 5 and my testimony made purposely brief at the June hearings in Washington is now a matter of record, in addition to observations of general principles which were made earlier in the Senate hearings at Eastham, which are now part of the record of all hearings.

I am formally requesting herewith to appear before your committee at the forthcoming hearings in Eastham in December.

Since the unavoidable postponement of action in the last Congress much has happened on the cape which is of serious consequence to Cape Codders, be they either proponents or opponents of the park. So disturbing have these developments been that I wrote to Director Wirth on August 9 to draw his attention to these developments which were basically challenging the retroactive closure clause in the bills as proposed. I am taking the liberty of repeating substantially my report to Director Wirth to your committee and to urge you before the hearings to make a thorough survey of the depredations of the cape during the last year or so.

By far the larger part of the destruction has actually taken place within the designated area and since September 30, 1959.

Here are a few examples:

1. Long Pond, Wellfleet: 21 lots of very narrow frontage are up for sale. (One sold to a Mr. Hughes from New York for $6,500—just over an acre.) Agents: Lesser, partner with Selectman Frazier in real estate and/or Walling (see Horse Leach below).
2. Herring Pond, Wellfleet: Two lots of some 5 acres together sold to a Mr. Halperin by Breuer. Agent: Lesser. Mr. Halperin is putting up two houses; one for rent.
3. Horse Leach Pond, Truro: One lot bought from Phillips by Walling. Intention: To build a house for rent. Mr. Walling already has five houses for rent in this area.
4. Truro, east of Route 6: North of radar station, some 100 acres with ocean frontage subdivided into small lots. Topsoil sold to road contractor, with the result that there is enough road surface to serve a sizable town. Owner and agent: Anthony Duarte. Mr. Duarte is a member of the Truro Planning Board.
5. Highland Light area, north Truro: A grid subdivision of small lots. Agent: Anthony Duarte and others.

These and similar operations are in large part conducted by two declared and persistent opponents of the park, whom Congressman Keith invited at a Truro Town Hall meeting, this year, in person, naming Mr. Frazier as the coordinator, to prepare boundary counterproposals, declaring himself—sight unseen—ready to go along with these.

These peculiar proposals were presented at the Washington hearings.

In view of the long postponement of any action on the park, it appears necessary for the Government to go on the record immediately on at least a few points:

1. Is the retroactive clause enforcible, and is it the Department of Interior's intention to enforce it, if and when the bill is enacted? The innocent buyers of inflated value property must be protected from the real estate sharks.
2. If the retroactive clause is in any way vulnerable then the Government is in fact, if not in law, being blackmailed and the cost of a public amenity is being deliberately raised by private speculators. Is this an offense?

3. The depredations listed above (and others) occur in the largest and deepest tract of the proposed park area. If conservation is to remain a primary objective of the bill, then the Department of the Interior may have been remiss in not providing proper interim protection. There is indeed some indication that the spoiling of Cape Cod has actually been accelerated since the park announcement was made. Much talk about preventing roadside "honkitonk" has taken away attention from the more fundamental destruction of natural resources.

As you know, I am one of a number of enthusiastic supporters of the Cape Cod Park bill. We can no longer be sure that the objectives for which we have been fighting are obtainable. Indeed we have evidence that one of the original sponsors has apparently either abandoned the original intention or has no comprehension of the conservation issues involved.

If the bill in Congress is not to degenerate into a conservationwise empty gesture, some unequivocal clarification and action by the Department of Interior is required in the interim.

Respectfully yours,

SERGE CHERMAYEFF,
Professor of Architecture.

APPENDIX 4

WELLFLEET, MASS., *June 25, 1960.*

The EDITOR,
Cape Codder.

DEAR SIR: The congressional hearings on the proposed national seashore bills, S. 2636 and H.R. 9050, provided a surprise for some of the Cape Codders who went to Washington to testify.

The unveiling by the selectmen of the lower cape towns, aided and abetted rather curiously by Representative Keith, a sponsor of the bills, of alternative boundary proposals for the congressional subcommittee revealed an astonishing jigsaw puzzle of unrelated bits and pieces.

Marked with yellow tape over a giant air view photograph of the whole lower cape, the sum of obviously unconnected town proposals looked like something in which wildlife, poachers, game wardens, residents, visitors, tourists, and probably police and delinquents might play madman's hide-and-seek.

The later proposals at Eastham make things worse.

There is, unfortunately, a serious side to this lunacy which claims to improve the Cape Cod condition.

Surely "togetherness" of so many public servants could have produced something more unified and sensible than completely separate and independent town interests: suggestions of land allotment unrelated to each other or to the purposes of the bills under discussion.

If anyone doubts the contention of this startled observer let him take a careful look at the proposals thus made by the selectmen and publicly blessed at the hearings by Representative Keith.

A fair sample of the proposals' quality is the Truro bottleneck between the only possible whole cape width of park, through which all visitors will have to run the gauntlet of honkitonks along a mile or so of Route 6. Who is this good for?

Or look at the two islands and two strips of town properly surrounded by park, miniature West Berlin to plague our future, plugged by the Wellfleet selectmen.

One of these slices irrelevantly right through the middle of Thoreau's pond paradise, along the Truro-Wellfleet town line.

This could benefit no one except owners of unimproved land in this land, anxious to make a profit. Surely one of the major assets slated for conservation could have received equal attention from the fathers of Truro, and with better reason.

Although some of the proposals were obviously of a different category and offered with genuine concern for the good of the particular town, I respectfully suggest that Cape Codders look carefully again at the bills as presently drafted. They will learn that all house owners living within the boundaries of the park could have ample protection without change of these boundaries.

If they further care to consult any competent and imaginative planner acquainted with the problem, and read the economic report on the lower cape's future, they will learn that the towns' area outside the park, as designated in the bills under discussion, are ample for all town purposes: the conservation of their character, the accommodation of the future population, the provision of new facilities essential to their economic growth of a changed and very accessible cape.

While they are at it, Cape Codders might have a careful look at the mandate their selectmen claim to have received to alter boundaries which in general are linked to proposals prepared on a comprehensive scale, with impartiality and care. Who gave them this mandate?

Is it possible that at least some people on the lower cape are being bamboozled about this bill?

Yours,

SERGE CHERMAYEFF,

A border man who pays taxes to Truro and spends his cape money in Wellfleet with no apologies.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you, professor.

Are there any questions from the committee members? Congressman Keith would like to say a word to you, Professor Chermayeff, in view of a statement you made referring to him.

Mr. KEITH. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

This is a rather extraordinary procedure, and I appreciate your sympathetic attention to my request.

I just wanted to correct a statement that you have in this evidence which you submit here on page 2.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. Which evidence is that?

Mr. KEITH. This is one to Congressman Aspinall.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. Which date? There are two letters.

Mr. KEITH. The one in which you refer to me.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. I hope I referred to you in both of them.

Mr. KEITH. It was dated November 21. It is the only one I happened to see.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. There is another letter.

Mr. KEITH. At any rate, you state that I declared myself, sight unseen, ready to go along with certain amendments in the proposal. And nothing could be further from the truth. You suggested that anybody who could find errors in your testimony should point them out.

The second thing is that you said I should consult with consultants.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. I did not say that, Congressman.

Mr. KEITH. With proponents?

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. No; I did not even say that.

I said you might have sought some views of proponents.

Mr. KEITH. I certainly did. I wanted to correct that on the record. It has been my consistent practice to consult with proponents and opponents, while in Congress.

I regret to say we did not have very much information submitted by you to our office, but we did have a great deal of consultation with other strong proponents of the park, and that is why I filed the bill. And in my opinion, we are much more likely to have a good national seashore, if we entertain these proposals that the towns have put forth.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. May I ask Congressman Keith a very simple question?

Mrs. PFOST. I am very sorry, the rules of the committee do not permit witnesses to ask congressional members.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. May I then comment? May I answer?

Mrs. PFOST. You may answer.

Mr. CHERMAYEFF. I think it would be interesting to know whether the proposals have received Congressman Keith's approval for the reasons already suggested by myself because they do not permit an idea of conservation. They simply mean that there will be a bill. Now that bill may possibly appear to be useful conservation, but I suspect, and say this again without direct reference to the park authority—but since it is the knowledge of ecology and conservation it will be found there will not be any satisfactory conservation possible, and in fact, it will become a recreational park because the beach will be the only thing left. Therefore, I really question the wisdom of this proposal most seriously, and I do commend my question to your committee, Madam Chairman.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you very much, we appreciate your testimony, Professor Chermayeff.

Apparently this completes the slate of witnesses for this afternoon. Before we close, I should like to ask unanimous consent that telegrams from John P. Sylvia, Jr., of Falmouth, Mass., from Chester A. Crosby, from Clarence M. Chase, and from Cecil I. Goodspeed, Howard Sears, and Channing E. Hoxie, all against the park proposals, be inserted in the record.

Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Also, without objection, I should like a night letter to be included in the record, in favor of the park proposal, from Emmett Baker, president of the Massachusetts Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, from Congressman James A. Burke, 13th Congressional District of Massachusetts, and a second one from Congressman Burke, all of these in favor of the legislation, be incorporated in the record.

Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

(Documents referred to follow:)

FALMOUTH, MASS., *December 16, 1960.*

To Representative WAYNE H. ASPINALL:

I wish to state that I am personally unalterably opposed to proposed national seashore on Cape Cod.

Attorney JOHN P. SYLVIA, Jr.

OSTERVILLE, MASS.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Eastham Town Hall.

DEAR SIR: I am definitely opposed to the proposed national seashore park.

Respectfully,

CHESTER A. CROSBY.

HYANNIS, MASS., *December 16, 1960.*

To Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL:

As a native Cape Codder and former town clerk and treasurer of Barnstable (37 years), I strongly oppose the proposed national park.

CLARENCE M. CHASE.

OSTERVILLE, MASS., *December 16, 1960.*

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee,
Eastham, Mass.:

As a businessman and real estate broker I am concerned about the proposed national park in the lower cape area. While my base of operation is largely in the town of Barnstable and is some distance from the area, modified or not, of the park, I believe the effect would still be felt here. The economy of Cape

Cod may be discussed as sectional but in reality is closely geared and anything that impairs one area impairs the whole cape. I believe the establishment of a national park on Cape Cod to be a grave error, that the unhappiness of Cape Cod should not be thus penalized.

CECIL I. GOODSPEED.

OSTERVILLE, MASS., *December 16, 1960.*

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Eastham, Mass.:

Oppose establishment of national seashore park detrimental to Cape Cod.

HOWARD W. SEARS, *Town Clerk-Treasurer.*

SANDWICH, MASS., *December 16, 1960.*

Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPINALL: Being unable to be present I am sending this telegram to protest the establishment of a national park on Cape Code. The establishment of such a park would seriously affect the orderly and normal growth of Cape Cod, which we now enjoy and are able to plan and provide for in a manner most suited the overall economy of the cape, now and for the future.

CHANNING E. HOXIE,
Town Clerk, Treasurer, and Tax Collector.

PLYMOUTH, MASS., *December 16, 1960.*

Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Eastham Town Hall:

The Massachusetts Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc., representing over 10,000 sportsmen has repeatedly and unanimously favored the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

Massachusetts sportsmen want their natural resources used wisely for the benefit of all for the longest possible time. We know that the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park would accomplish this in a fair and equitable manner.

We urge prompt and favorable consideration for the establishment of the national seashore park.

EMMETT B. BAKER, *President,*
Massachusetts Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc.

QUINCY, MASS., *December 16, 1960.*

Hon. GRACIE PFOST,
Chairman, House Public Lands Subcommittee:

I heartily support the legislation filed by Senators John F. Kennedy and Leverett Saltonstall and my colleague, Congressman Hastings Keith, and urge favorable action on establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

Congressman JAMES A. BURKE,
13th Congressional District of Massachusetts.

QUINCY, MASS., *December 16, 1960.*

Congressman HASTINGS KEITH,
Eastham Town Hall, Eastham, Mass.:

I urge that you record me favorably on legislation to establish the Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

Congressman JAMES A. BURKE.

Without objection, the statements by the Congressmen that were placed in the record while the witnesses were coming forward this afternoon will be placed immediately following the congressional testimony. Is there objection to those being included in that place in the record?

Hearing none, it is so ordered.

The committee will reconvene in the morning at 9:30 and we hope to be able to start promptly. The subcommittee stands in adjournment.

(Whereupon, at 5:50 p.m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 9:45 a.m., Saturday, December 17, 1960.)

CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1960

EASTHAM TOWN HALL,
Eastham, Mass.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 9:45 a.m., in the Eastham Town Hall, Eastham, Mass., Hon. Gracie Pfost (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mrs. PFOST. The Subcommittee on Public Lands will now come to order for further consideration of the Cape Cod National Seashore legislation.

Our first group of witnesses this morning will be Mr. S. Osborn Ball, Mr. Fritz Bultman, and Mary Heaton Vorse. Mr. Ball, are you going to testify this morning?

Mr. BALL. Maybe that is what you call it, I will speak, if I am permitted.

Mrs. PFOST. Will you please come to the rostrum?

Mr. BALL. Up there?

Mrs. PFOST. Yes.

While the witnesses are assembling, I would like to ask unanimous consent to have placed in the record immediately following the congressional testimony yesterday morning a telegram which was received yesterday from Gov. John A. Volpe, Governor-elect of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered. The telegram to the committee is in favor of the legislation.

Will you proceed, Mr. Ball?

Mr. BALL. Madam Chairman, what is the time limit?

Mrs. PFOST. Approximately a maximum of 15 minutes for each individual.

STATEMENT OF S. OSBORN BALL, SECRETARY, PROVINCETOWN CIVIC ASSOCIATION RE PROVINCE LANDS, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mr. BALL. My name is S. Osborn Ball. Please don't be misled by my initials. I am the trustee and therefore have title to 2 miles of ocean front in Truro and it is considerable acreage. I am also secretary of the Provincetown Civic Association, which is dedicated to what we think are the better interests of Provincetown.

I would like to speak briefly on both situations.

Now, the evidence you see around us tells us that Cape Cod will succumb in its entirety to the needs of the ocean approximately 4,000 years from now. So our only problem is what to do with it during the 4,000 years. I think the time has passed when we oldtimers can hope that Cape Cod will stay the way it is.

Since this park was proposed the rape of this beloved country has begun in earnest. Therefore, we have absolute proof it is going to change and then the issue is, Should it be done by bulldozers? by money-mad people? by banks wanting to lend? by builders wanting quick jobs? by loan sharks? Or is it to be done by the U.S. Government in another manner?

As a trustee of a valuable piece of land, I cannot advocate one or the other. My father and mother have their own cemetery on that land. I have a big dog cemetery. I am inclined to think if I weren't a trustee that, since we have a choice of evils, that the Government can do it less terribly, less awfully than the present method by bulldozer and rape of all of these beautiful hills and country.

I wish, however, may it please this honorable body, and Madam Chairman, that you would be more honest than you have been. I do not say that you have been intellectually dishonest, but I have listened to these hearings for 2 years now. Citizens are always asking, "Can I keep my home? Can I leave it to my beloved people? my own family?" and similar questions.

And our legal representatives and legislative representatives, without any embarrassment, have said, "Why, that is what the bill says. Of course you can." Now, this is a fraud because no matter what a bill says, it can be amended in the twinkling of an eye. Mr. Udall will have vast powers, as all Cabinet members have. He will only have to write out a directive, it can all be changed. And therefore, I implore you to let the citizens realize that the question isn't that; the question is, Shall the cape be completely changed from Provincetown by private interests, or shall it be changed by the operation of the National Park Service?

But as far as assuring the people that they can stay, why, there isn't enough steel barbed wire fence in the world to allow me to stay on my estate because how can I keep the people out? You can't, because you would have to have around-the-clock guards stationed every 200 or 300 feet. So it is silly for us to decide yes or no, should there be a park on any such minor consideration as that: it is simply ineffective.

Now, we come to Provincetown. If I would not be considered more ridiculous than I am, I would get down on my knees to your honorable committee, and plead with you not to let the town of Provincetown take any portion of the province lands. This beautiful country, there is nothing like it in the whole United States, was taken for two purposes a century ago: to prevent those gigantic dunes from engulfing Provincetown in the northerly gales, and to preserve for posterity one of the most incredibly beautiful places in the country. Provincetown doesn't need this bill they have filed. Don't let them have it. They talk about the economy. I am going to die not knowing anything about economy. There isn't any such thing. That is a fancy word for builders who want to make money, for real estate men to develop it, for banks, for lawyers, people crazy to make more money.

If you take the entire original amount of Cape Cod that you planned, you wouldn't hurt the economy any more than if you take half of it. All you are going to do is instead of having a hundred banks as we now have, you will have 500 banks; instead of 100 big contractors, you will have 500. That is what they mean by economy. Let's face it.

Now, Provincetown is surrounded by bay, ocean, moving sand dunes. You wouldn't build a store on a dead end street. This is a dead end street, 50 miles away from nowhere. If you add any more residences or businesses to that area, you will choke it to death. And I say that our selectmen and our town manager and the rest of the people who are pushing for this thing are doing it to destroy it, they are doing it because they envision a town manager getting $5,000. If you take this dune, he will be able to get $15,000.

That is the most beautiful part of the whole park taking. If you are going to take a part, take all of the province lands. I feel very strongly about this because it will most certainly ruin our town. In the summertime we have 15,000 cars coming into Provincetown a day. What is going to happen if they increase that? Our town manager told us at the last civic meeting that Schine Hotel Corp. had already said that they would be glad to come in and develop that beautiful country, those beautiful ponds, and dunes, with modern hotels, golf courses, and heaven knows what, and maybe even a bust in the center of the town of McCarthy, for all we know. I say we don't need that, we don't want it.

You heard Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon in the past television debate. Did any one of these people representing various States ever mention God Almighty? No, not once. Let us think a little bit of the spiritual values today, the good things, the clean things. There is going to be plenty of money under the Kennedy program. They are even going to let me get taken care of for free, medically, whether I need it or not. They are going to keep giving, giving. That will take care of anybody's private economy. We don't have to work any more.

I sincerely urge you to do all you can to save our little town, terribly maligned as it is, and unjustly maligned. Save us from a fate much worse than anything the atomic bomb can do to us because it will do it by degrees, it will choke us, it will finish us.

I thank you.

(Statement of Mr. Ball follows:)

STATEMENT OF S. OSBORN BALL, SECRETARY, THE PROVINCETOWN CIVIC ASSOCIATION

THE NATIONAL PARK ISSUE

As to the 2 miles of ocean front land in Truro of which I am trustee, my fiduciary capacity prevents me from assuming any active part in this issue. I have had fabulous offers for portions of this trust. The legal duty to beneficiaries is clear. I can, however, state what appears to be the true issue. The true issue is not squarely met even yet. The true issue is not whether the citizens wish to keep the cape as it is for of course everyone wants that. The true issue is that since it, the cape, cannot possibly be kept as it is, by which of the two available methods shall it be changed.

Shall it be changed by the present speeding up of the present process of raping our beloved country by sale and barter? Or shall it be changed by the preservation of huge areas protected from this rape by those greedy for gold even though that preservation means turning it over to millions of tourists for inspection and mounting visitation? Certainly zoning can only slow up but not stop sale and barter, for men and women are found at their worst when the rainbow indicates the presence of gold. Right at this very moment speculators devoid of spiritual content wreak havoc on our beloved country. One heard nothing of God in the recent campaign debates. But those who love this country—and many they are—inherited much more than campaign planks. They inherited, and they hope to keep the spiritual calm that this great, boundless beauty breathes upon us as surely as the surrounding oceans give of its ozone. They like not this mounting greed for gold which reminds them of men rushing for the lifeboats on a sinking ship. They would like to die the way their beloved country now is at the very least. Better had they died, then, 10 years ago.

THE STATE PROVINCE LANDS

If the town of Provincetown is allowed to take any portion at all of the province lands—and their officials brazenly propose to take its most incredibly beautiful and restful part—it will be a bloody execution removing the fountain head—indeed the very pièce de résistance—of the purpose of any national park. But thinking Provincetowners are less concerned with that than they are with the disastrous effect it will on a little town, hemmed in by dune and sea, a very dead end town wherein there can be neither rhyme nor reason for expansion. In no sense is it a "hub." Not a single bona fide reason can be given to expand a town so located. Hundreds of acres of land suitable for dwellings remains unoccupied. Yet the perpertrators of this hoax say they have already interested the Schine Hotel people in its development. Do we have such spiritual beauty and peaceful ponds and moors and quiet expanse for such a purpose, or do the town officials see in this overloading of a dead end street a chance for more and bigger salaries and political advancements?

Render unto these Caesars the things that are for Caesars but leave us alone to our beautiful little town with its beauty as God bestowed upon it. Let the Federal Government preserve and reserve it. Leave it, not for Schine Hotels, but for the eyes of the millions of touring Americans who will come from all of the States in our Union to see for themselves how lovely it is. If Rachael Carson be right when, in "The Sea Around Us," she says that Cape Cod will sink beneath the waves 4,000 years from now, let it sink with this loveliness intact.

CONCLUSION

Obviously, citizens more concerned with spiritual values, and with a profound love for this paradise will always be outnumbered by the mortgagees, the speculators, the builders, and the dollarwise ambitious. The changes in the beloved country cannot be stopped. Shall this be done by the long successions of rape already in process? Shall this be done by reservation and preservation although it means inviting millions yet unborn into the county of Barnstable? Doubtless the bones of my father and mother and of my dogs lying in the cemeteries within the Ball trust will be confiscated by a national park. But will my tears that day be any less than those shed when, instead, the giant bulldozers of giant speculators destroy not only these remains but also the beautiful land itself? Let others argue the point.

Mrs. PFOST. Our next witness will be Mrs. Vorse, please.

STATEMENT OF MARY HEATON VORSE, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mrs. VORSE. Madam Chairman, Congressman Keith, members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, my name is Mary Heaton Vorse. I have been a voter and taxpayer of Provincetown for over 53 years. My children and grandchildren have all attended Provincetown schools, so my circle of friends extends over all Provincetown, among young and old.

My occupation is that of a professional writer. I have written 17 books and hundreds of articles. One book, "Time and the Town," is a Provincetown chronicle. I have had considerable Government service. I was on the Committee of Public Information, Foreign Division, under George Creel of Colorado; headed Public Information in the Indian Bureau for nearly 2 years; was an overseas member of the Red Cross (Italian and Balkan Commission); briefly a member of the American Relief Administration led by President Hoover; I worked for UNRRA in Greece and was attached to the Italian Mission from Christmas 1945 to 1947.

Provincetown has been my home, its welfare my chief concern.

I have come here today, as I am sure we almost all have, whether for the park or against it, because we love the cape and wish to preserve its essential quality which speculators are destroying.

I myself am wholeheartedly for the national seashore park and against any essential changes in the park's boundaries as they were first planned.

I wish especially to protest against taking any part of the province lands destined for the national park as hurtful to the park, the cape, and Provincetown. I can assure you that this reflects the opinion of large numbers of my townspeople.

I cannot understand how the selectmen and others can support the park as they do, and at the same time work with tireless concentration to mutilate and destroy the park by taking its most unique feature, the province lands. They prepare for their expected visitors by destroying the very thing they have come to see.

The province lands are the natural termination to the 60-mile sweep of the great beach. They are an indivisible and necessary part of the national seashore park.

Nearly 75 years ago the province lands were made a State park by act of legislature because of the unique character of the country.

They are unique. Long ago, I wrote:

> I do not know of any country which is so wild and so diverse within so small a compass. This little piece of land, small when you measure it in square miles, is unlike any other place; nor have I found any one who has seen anything like it.

Thoreau, looking at them in autumn, says:

> I never saw an autumnal landscape so beautifully painted as this was * * *. This was perhaps the most novel and remarkable sight I saw on the cape.

There is no other spot in the seashore park that combines all the noteworthy features, historical, geological and biological. It is a bird watcher's paradise. There are few places in these United States where side by side are found the forest birds and the waders—the herons and loons and also the sea birds, from the least tern to the great arctic gulls.

And finally, the province lands are an eloquent and conclusive argument of the urgent need for a national seashore park, if we are to preserve our cape. What would have happened to it and our beaches if left in private hands we may see lamentably in Wellfleet and Truro, where land speculators have descended like gannets on a dead fish, hoping to glut themselves before the park could stop them.

Consider Provincetown itself in relation to the province lands. Provincetown lies along the long curve of the bay. Behind it, enclosing it and guarding it from exploitation are the province lands, a crescent of woods, marsh, ponds and moors. Behind them is the vast solitude of the dunes, and then the Atlantic Ocean.

It is proposed to amputate the whole of the wooded crescent for development, leaving only for the park, like the paring of a fingernail, the dunes, and the shore. Provincetown has been a great fishing port, It is still the fourth port on the North Atlantic seaboard; fish will be caught here while there are fish in the sea.

The town, through the last 50 years, has become the acknowledged art center of the East. No one planned it that way. No one said, "Come, let's be an art center." It developed spontaneously, drawing its creative force from the spirit of the town, which bred great captains and explorers, as it has inspired artists and writers.

Provincetown is more than an art center. The Provincetown Players were born here and had their first playhouse on my wharf. They changed the history of the theater in America. There has been a summer theater here in the Players' tradition ever since, and they didn't think they were going to change anything. They didn't plan to change the theater, they planned to give a few plays, but it turned into a great movement, so strong was its creative force.

The Symphony Society of the cape was founded here and developed by Jo Hawthorne, internationally famous conducter, son of the great painter, Charles Hawthorne.

The number of fine craftsmen, workers in ceramics, leather, silver, wood, and other media, is increasing yearly. If this natural trend continues unchecked, Provincetown will become not only the art center of the East, but the cultural center. If you tamper with the province lands, we may well have instead an imitation Narragansett Pier, or a fake Tuxedo Park.

What has made Provincetown is its unique position. The town and the back country, as we call the province lands, are indivisible as a human body. They cannot be cut apart and live.

Through the centuries the province lands developed their austere, wild beauty. Man trifles with the balance of nature at his peril. To cut off the province lands, by which the town has been protected and nourished, is to destroy the very thing that made it a unique town, quick with creation.

I plead for its preservation. Our country began here. The Compact was written in this harbor. Leave this historic town to fulfill its destiny.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you very much, Mrs. Vorse. [Applause.]

Will you remain there, just a moment, please, you and Mr. Ball, until we find out if there are questions by the committee?

I have just been advised that Mr. Bultman has arrived. Would you please come forward and give us your statement, please?

STATEMENT OF FRITZ BULTMAN, PROVINCETOWN PROPERTY OWNERS' PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mr. Bultman. I would just like to introduce into the record of these hearings a letter from the Provincetown Property Owners' Protective Association. It is composed of 100 taxpayers representing 64 pieces of property in Provincetown, but most of these taxpayers live in the New York area.

Mrs. Pfost. Do they favor or oppose the park?

Mr. Bultman. They favor the park and the present boundaries and that is the body of this letter. Shall I read the letter?

Mrs. Pfost. Yes; you may.

Mr. Bultman. It is addressed to Congressman Aspinall, but I think it is addressed to you directly now. [Mr. Bultman then read the letter reproduced below.]

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you very much. Because of the names attached, the letter will be placed in the record.

(Letter referred to follows:)

PROVINCETOWN PROPERTY OWNERS' PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,
Provincetown, Mass., December 14, 1960.

CONGRESSMAN WAYNE W. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you on behalf of the members of the Provincetown Property Owners' Protective Association whose names and addresses are listed at the foot of this letter.

At a meeting of the association the members hereinafter listed unanimously voted in favor of sending you the following communication:

We urge you to oppose Massachusetts House bill 3290 which would convey to the town of Provincetown a tract of land within the limits of the province lands at Provincetown, which lands are now included in the national park as projected in the measure now before the U.S. Congress, for the following reasons:

(1) Included in the proposed conveyance is an area consisting of woods, marshes, ponds, and dunes, which area is included within the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Act and within the boundaries as defined in the Saltonstall-Kennedy-Keith bill, as revised. This area would constitute one of the most beautiful portions of the proposed park and should be included as a part of the national park, in order that its natural beauty may be preserved and conserved. In the hands of private individuals it would be highly commercialized and would, undoubtedly, produce a honky-tonk development bordering on the park.

(2) The area in question is needed as a protective barrier between the dunes and the town of Provincetown and should not be destroyed by a conversion of same into a commercial development.

(3) The area in question is a haven for natural wildlife and should for that reason be conserved and preserved.

(4) The area in question is not necessary for the expansion of the town of Provincetown, as there are ample lands now available for such expansion which have not been used to date.

Respectfully yours,

MAURICE C. BRIGADIER,
President, Provincetown Property Owners' Protective Association.
JEAN BULTMAN, *Secretary.*
VICTORIA BRAUN, *Treasurer.*

PARTIAL LIST ONLY OF MEMBERS OF ASSOCIATION

Mr. and Mrs. Maurice C. Brigadier, 479 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Nathan Halper, 481 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Fritz Bultman, Miller Hill Road, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Harry Pinkerson, 49A Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Henry Rose, Bradford Street Extension, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Kaplan, Commercial and Allerton Streets, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Mervin Jules, 613 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Mark Rothko, 250 Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Dr. and Mrs. Arlie Sinaiko, 597 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Boris Margo, Atkins Mayo Road, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Byron Browne, 600 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Chaim Gross, Franklin Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Henry Rothman, Commercial and Allerton Streets, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Nassos Daphnis, Bang Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Abe Burrows, 551 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Dr. Alice Fabian, 665 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Dr. and Mrs. Edmund Braun, 472 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Frederic Varady, 204 Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Richmond, 40 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Irving Marantz, 200 Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Victor Candell, 22 Bangs Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Dr. Diana Kemeny, Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Kardos, Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. Warren Hassmer, 236 Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.

Dr. Yela Brichta, 326A Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. Joseph Acker, 605 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. John F. Bosworth, 605 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Umberto Romano, 422 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Motherwell, Commercial and Allerton Streets, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Manacher, 23 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. Julian deMirsky, Webster Avenue, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Weiner, 345A Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Newman, 600 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Wallace Bassford, Snow Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Donald Thompson, 186 Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Leo Manzo, 592 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Seong Moy, 18 Brewster Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Albert Rubenstein, 565 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mrs. Vivian DePinna, 50 Commercial Street, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Philip Katzen, Allerton and Bradford Streets, Provincetown, Mass.
Mr. and Mrs. Herman Maril, 252 Bradford Street, Provincetown, Mass.

Mrs. PFOST. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon. Do you have any questions, Mr. Ullman?

Mr. ULLMAN. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

You say the town of Provincetown does have, in your opinion, room for expansion, without the province lands?

Mr. BULTMAN. I think there has been a survey recently of that and it shows that there is almost as much land available for expansion as is presently built on.

Mr. ULLMAN. I do not believe that information has been made available to the committee. I would urge that if such a study has been made, that it should be made as a supplemental statement.

Mr. BULTMAN. I think it can be verified by the maps. I believe Mrs. DeWitt has the areas. She knows the actual area.

Mr. ULLMAN. It is possible this is incorporated in the Park Service testimony.

Mr. BULTMAN. It is not only there, but private people have made a map of the town, they made certain measurements, and there is so much and so much land that has been built on, and so much and so much land, almost double; that has not been built on at all, which is in the hands of private individuals.

Mr. ULLMAN. What percentage of the taxpayers and property owners signed this letter?

Mr. BULTMAN. This covered 64 pieces. We got the actual signatures for this letter of 40-odd signatures, 40-odd pieces of property covered.

Mr. ULLMAN. Out of the 64?

Mr. BULTMAN. Out of 64.

Mr. ULLMAN. I see.

Mr. BULTMAN. This is only in the New York area that we were able to get this number of people together in this short time. This became apparent when the boundary changes started to come to public notice. We did not know about it until this October.

Mr. ULLMAN. Thank you.

I just wanted to commend the other witnesses for very able statements, and, of course, particularly Mrs. Vorse for a very fine statement. Thank you.

Mrs. PFOST. The gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I am not sure I get just what you have in mind here. You refer to the province lands?

Mr. BULTMAN. Yes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is a State park now?

Mr. BULTMAN. That is a State park now.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You want to leave it as a State park?

Mr. BULTMAN. No; that this be included in the national park in its present state, without changing the boundaries. There is a plan to change these boundaries and take from the province lands certain area and put them in the boundaries of Provincetown. This is not needed, we feel, for the growth of the town.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Before there was talk of the national park, were you satisfied with the State park as it is now?

Mr. BULTMAN. Yes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You would be willing to leave it as it is; you are satisfied with it?

Mr. BULTMAN. If it remains the way it is.

Mrs. PFOST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Yes,

Mrs. PFOST. It is actually a State park, or merely State-owned land?

Mr. BULTMAN. I am informed it is a State park.

Mrs. VORSE. It is a State park since 1893.

Mr. BULTMAN. It is a State park and has been so since 1893. But it has been this way from the beginning, and it is just now——

Mrs. PFOST. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Yes.

Mrs. PFOST. Are we to understand that it is not actually operated as a normal State park would be, but that it is really in a state of preservation?

Mr. BULTMAN. Yes; it is in the state of preservation. It is technically a State park, but I do not think it is run as a State park.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you.

Mr. BULTMAN. But it is preserved. This is what we would like to see continued.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You referred to a Massachusetts House bill 3290——

Mr. BULTMAN. Yes.

Mr. CHENOWETH (continuing). Which would convey to the town of Provincetown the tract of land within the limits of province lands. Is that the park you are talking about now?

Mr. BULTMAN. That is right.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Which land is now included?

Mr. BULTMAN. That is right.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Who is promoting that legislation?

Mr. BULTMAN. That is being promoted by town officials.

Mr. CHENOWETH. They want to destroy the State park?

Mr. BULTMAN. They want to introduce that land, to take over that land as part of Provincetown to develop commercially. There is no actual need for that as far as——

Mr. CHENOWETH. You say they want to develop it commercially?

Mr. BULTMAN. Yes. At a recent meeting, I think Mr. Ball will bear me out, there was talk of building hotels and motels back there to take care of the proposed visitors.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think Mr. Snow testified here yesterday that was to be for residential purposes only.

Mr. BULTMAN. We have been told by the town manager that he had letters from a hotel chain and that it would be used for hotels and motels to take care of the expected visitors to the park area.

Mr. CHENOWETH. You feel that the town of Provincetown now has expanded about as far as it should?

Mr. BULTMAN. Well, it has more land, there is more land within the present boundaries of the town to expand. I think there are 400 acres of nonmarshland to be built on still within the boundaries of Provincetown. I believe there are 500 acres that are built on at present. And it seems that 400 acres would prove ample for building, for future expansion. The town could expand almost double its present size.

Mr. CHENOWETH. How many acres are in the State park?

Mr. BULTMAN. In the State park?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Yes.

Mr. BULTMAN. I do not have those figures.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Just roughly, just approximately?

Mr. BULTMAN. I am told about 3,000. I do not have the exact figures. But the part the town has tried to acquire through this House bill is the woodland area of the State park.

Mr. CHENOWETH. When was that effort first started to get this land?

Mr. BULTMAN. It was started last spring and the bill went through the House of Representatives here in Massachusetts during the summer months. It was not generally known until this fall that the bill had passed the House of Representatives and at that point, various groups formed and this was one group that formed in the New York area, taxpayers in Massachusetts who felt that the bill would harm the development of the town rather than help it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Do I understand that effort then was precipitated by the fact that they would rather have it in Provincetown rather than go into the national park?

Mr. BULTMAN. Yes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Otherwise, they would leave it as it is?

Mr. BULTMAN. One or the other, but not for commercial development.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I think that is all, thank you.

Mrs. PFOST. The gentleman from Alaska?

Mr. RIVERS. Madam Chairman and Mr. Bultman, the Park Service witness yesterday testified that they would expect the towns to provide overnight accommodations for visitors and related services. Now, I hear everyone almost disclaiming any intent to do anything that is of a commercial nature. Do you not think there is going to have to be some provision made for some additional accommodations for the visitors in Provincetown?

Mr. BULTMAN. I think that there will have to be and I think there is area within the present boundaries of Provincetown to build considerable amounts of commercial development.

Mr. RIVERS. I see.

Mr. BULTMAN. Within the present boundaries.

Mr. RIVERS. This unused land within the present boundaries is privately owned, is it not?

Mr. BULTMAN. Yes, it is privately owned.

Mr. RIVERS. You refer to it as available. Will these people that own it jar loose at all to let it be used?

Mr. BULTMAN. There is at the moment, I believe, up for sale a tract of 20-odd acres, and this land has no roads in it yet. The available land is not developed, there are no roads or lights or water there yet. It is possible just by increasing or extending the road in Provincetown, the present roads, to operate this land. It would not be another community. The thing is that we feel building back in this area, that is State land and is designated as part of the park that it would become another community whereas there is a possibility of extending the present facilities and opening large tracts, yes. There is quite a lot of land there. I think it could be made available. There is no reason—the reason people haven't sold it is that until now there are no roads, no facilities, water or lights or anything else back there.

Mr. RIVERS. That is all, Madam Chairman, thank you.

Mrs. PFOST. Are there further questions?

The Chair wishes to thank the three of you very much for very fine statements.

Our next group of witnesses will be George L. Cross, selectman, town of Barnstable, Chester Crocker, Eastham Planning Board, Dr. Madeline Winslow, Truro, Kenneth Turner, Cotuit, and Rev. Earl B. Luscomb. Will Victor F. Adams come up, too, please?

The first witness will be Mr. Cross.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE L. CROSS, SELECTMAN, BARNSTABLE, MASS.

Mr. CROSS. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, Congressman Keith and ladies and gentlemen, my name is George L. Cross and I am a resident of Hyannis, Mass. I am a selectman in the town of Barnstable, Mass. Barnstable is the largest town in the county of the proposed site of a national seashore park. Townships pay a proportionate share of the operation of the county government and the town of Barnstable pays 46 percent of this cost.

Cape Cod (Barnstable County) is a small island connected to the mainland by two bridges. Because of this very unique feature, and other characteristics, the whole county is very much unified in its actions and thoughts. The effects of traffic, taxes, zoning, employment, and other economic trends we have in one town are bound to be of concern to all the others. I have heard and read much on this subject.

I am opposed to the national seashore park being established on Cape Cod. All of the towns in this country have public beaches plus many ways of access to the water. There are no restrictions on these beaches. In some of the areas small charges are made for parking privileges and nowhere is there a charge for the use of the beach or bathhouse.

To give you some facts on the numbers, sizes, and facilities of a particular town I will list those of the town of Barnstable. There are 21 public beaches in the town. They have a total of 831 acres and extend 31,363 lineal feet. In addition to the aforementioned beaches, there are 47 ways of access to the water for the general public in the town of Barnstable.

The selectmen of the town of Barnstable are proposing to the voters in March that they acquire another 600 acres of beach adjacent to a parcel now owned by the town of 787 acres. Along this beautiful beach the town will own in one continuous piece 14,900 feet of beach frontage and a total of 1,431 acres.

May I emphasize again that they are open to the general public. The citizens of Barnstable feel that these beaches will care for the needs of any number that will ever visit our community.

In an article in the New York Times of March 12, 1959, Mr. Conrad Wirth, Director of the Park Service, was quoted as saying, "that he estimated that it might cost $16 million to acquire the land." Many of the people on Cape Cod feel that this is a very conservative figure and that the cost of the land takings and establishments will be well in excess of $16 million.

Yesterday, Mr. Frazier stated that he is chairman of the board of selectmen and also assessor. He further stated he has held these offices for the last 22 years. I have personally known him for these number of years and I have found him to be a capable selectman and assessor. He is one who knows his town and has a great deal of experience in the field of appraising real estate. Because of this confidence in his ability and because I want you to have facts, I wish to call your attention again to some of the points he so well made in regard to economics and costs that he feels pertain to his town.

Mr. Frazier stated that the proposed park would include 75 percent of the land in Wellfleet, leaving only 4,700 acres, one-half of which is marshland. He also said 355 buildings or dwellings are included in this proposal and he thought the cost of taking just in his town would be $12 million.

Mr. Horton, a selectman from the town of Truro said in his remarks that his town would have a drastic loss in tax revenues and he felt that a police department now strained would have a much greater burden if this park were to come into being.

Mr. Robert McNeece, selectman from Chatham said if Morris Island was included in the proposed park $50,000 per year income to the town would be lost. I call your attention to these remarks of Mr. Frazier, Mr. Horton, and Mr. McNeece for I feel they are very pertinent and point out to you the economic effects the park proposal could have. These opinions are from men qualified by years of experience and leadership in their town.

Since the beginning of this proposed park, it has been apparent to me that those representing the Park Service would accept nothing short of the original proposal.

Just yesterday, a gentleman representing Mr. Conrad Wirth, in answer to a question from a committee member, said it was necessary to have the original proposal without modification. Many people and officials on Cape Cod felt some time ago, after hearing the Director speak, that the park was a certainty and we would get it whether we wanted it or not.

As a result of this feeling, I think the modification policy was born. However, at the hearings, the gentleman representing Mr. Wirth speaking yesterday, said these people should feel that their opinions and wishes have fallen on deaf ears.

The towns of Cape Cod have made beaches and parks available to the general public and we feel that there is no need for this action by the Federal Government. We take great pride in our form of government and believe that this proposal is an infringement of our home rule. We have made provisions to retain our beaches and marshes solely with our own money and any further steps in this respect should be done by our towns and county and paid for by them.

I would just like to call to your attention, in looking through the brochure of the Cape Cod National Seashore, prepared by the Department of the Interior, that on the first page it does show the beach. I would call your attention, if you are familiar with the action of the sea, that it certainly shows that there is a strong undertow and it would take one who is a very strong swimmer and a good swimmer to do any swimming there. They emphasize it further on the next to the last page by showing a different portion of the beach with the same conditions present, that it is a terrific undertow and great surf.

As one who has tried to swim in the area, I call it to your attention because you must not be just a swimmer, you must be a very strong swimmer to be able to swim there.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you, Mr. Cross.

Mr. CROSS. Madam Chairman and committee members, I do want to thank you for this opportunity. I enjoyed being with you in Washington last June. You have extended courtesies to the group that are with me this morning. To you and your committee I certainly want to say I appreciate it and your staff has been most cooperative. Thank you. [Applause.]

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you very much.

(Additional document to Mr. Cross' statement follows:)

BARNSTABLE TOWN HALL,
Hyannis, Mass.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED APRIL 19, 1960

Whereas, our Representative in Congress, Hastings Keith, and Senators Leverett Saltonstall and John F. Kennedy have sponsored a bill in Congress (S. 2636) proposing, through the medium of the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of Interior and Insular Affairs, to establish a national seashore park on Cape Code, and, although we believe our elected representatives in Congress have acted in good faith, we nevertheless, are firmly convinced they have made a grave mistake. It is evident that beyond all doubt they have been misled and deceived as to the true facts concerning this proposal, by certain personnel connected with the National Park Service who through unbounded enthusiasm, uncurbed exuberance, and superficial reasoning backed up by scholarly writers have presented what appears to be a plausible case; but if the bill should be enacted into law, it would be sure to defeat its own purpose. And, whereas we, the undersigned citizens of Cape Cod, being fully aware that a vast majority of our people recognize the danger to themselves and posterity and feel great apprehension and real grief we hereby firmly resolve:

To do all in our power to prevent the passage of this proposed law by going to Washington (all who can afford to), and under the leadership of our former Representative Donald W. Nicholson appearing before the several committees before which the bills must be heard.

And, we further resolve and pledge ourselves to urge others to also go to Washington.

And, further we pledge ourselves to urge upon all people, resident and nonresident alike, to write at once to Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman of House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, and to Representative Keith and Senators Kennedy and Saltonstall, Washington, D.C., protesting the passage of this act in its entirety without any amendments or modifications whatsoever. This is very important.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be filed in the Barnstable archives as an unofficial record in the town clerk's office in order that posterity may know that we, now living, did not surrender their birthright without a struggle.

Chester A. Crocker, selectman and assessor, 1929–50.
Nathan Ellis, surveyor of highways, town of Falmouth.
Donald W. Nicholson, former selectman of Wareham, Mass.; House of Representatives; president, Massachusetts Senate, and Representative in Congress.
George L. Cross, selectman and assessor, town of Barnstable.
William R. Crump, former selectman, town of Bourne.
Edwin F. Eldredge, former selectman, town of Chatham.
Kenneth Turner, master plumber and civic leader of Cotuit.
Edward E. Millikin, chairman, conservation commission, town of Eastham.
Walcott Ames, president, Barnstable County National Bank.
Maurice A. Moore, member planning board and Republican town committee, town of Eastham.
Leonard C. Pierce, selectman and assessor, town of Wellfleet.
Charles E. Frazer, Jr., selectman, assessor, and attorney, town of Wellfleet.
Prescott B. Cummings, planning board chairman, town of Eastham.
William B. Fleming, town of Wellfleet.
Cyril W. Downs, president, Wellfleet Savings Bank.
Antone Duarte, Jr., former selectman, town of Truro.
Elwood O. Mills, selectman and deputy sheriff, town of Mashpee.
Frank C. Ryder, cashier, First National Bank of Yarmouth.
Lawrence F. Crocker, finance committee chairman, town of Brewster.
Allen F. Jones, Barnstable legislator.
Channing E. Hoxie, town clerk, treasurer and tax collector, town of Sandwich.
Joseph F. Bazzinotti, former selectman, Sandwich.
Walter B. Chase, former president, Hyannis Trust Co.
James F. Pendergast, Hyannis Inn, Hyannis, Mass.
Charles L. Hamblin, former contractor and builder, Lantana, Fla.
Gilbert F. Smith, selectman, Sandwich, Mass.
Carl H. Hiler, clerk, board of selectmen, Sandwich, Mass.
Alvan H. Crocker, general contractor, Sandwich, Mass.
Norman E. Williams, plumbing and heating contractor, Falmouth, Mass.
John P. Sylvia, Jr., attorney at law, Falmouth, Mass.
Harold L. Baker, chief of police, Falmouth, Mass.
Ann B. Richardson, Elm Arch Inn, Falmouth, Mass.
Hoyt L. Savery, auto dealer, Falmouth, Mass.
Roger L. Savery, auto dealer, Falmouth, Mass.
Frederick W. Wormelle, Jr., president, Falmouth Marine Railway, Inc.
Hilding S. Hord, Race Lane, Marstons Mills.
Wilton B. Crosby, president, Crosby Yacht Building & Storage Co., Inc.
Chester A. Crosby, harbor master, town of Barnstable.
Victor F. Adams, chairman, board of selectmen, Barnstable.
Howard W. Sears, town clerk and treasurer, Barnstable.
Harry A. Jenkins, general manager, Oyster Harbors, Barnstable.
Clarence M. Chase, former town clerk and treasurer (37 years), Barnstable.
Gerard C. Besse, president, Hyannis Trust Co.
Henry L. Murphy, judge, first district court of Barnstable (Centerville).
Artemas G. Griffin, mason contractor, Marstons Mills, Mass.
Charles N. Libby, Farm Bureau agent, Cape Cod.
Hyman Burman, merchant, Barnstable, Mass.
Henry A. Ellis, attorney at law, member of General Court 8 years, town moderator 21 years, Hyannis, Mass.
E. Thomas Murphy, selectman and assessor, town of Barnstable.
Dr. Madaline Winslow, Truro, Mass.

George W. Foster, selectman and assessor, town of Brewster.
Lawrence A. Baker, chairman of selectmen, town of Brewster.
Fred H. Nash, chairman of public welfare and selectman, Brewster.

Received and filed in the clerk's office of the town of Barnstable on June 9, 1960.

A true copy, attest:

HOWARD W. SEARS, *Town Clerk.*

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chester Crocker?

STATEMENT OF CHESTER A. CROCKER, BARNSTABLE, MASS.

Mr. CROCKER. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, I was a selectman and assessor of the town of Barnstable for 21 years, 19 of which I was chairman of the board of selectmen, and in my capacity I have presided at innumerable hearings, and I remember that we were greatly relieved when someone submitted a brief to us and talked very briefly himself. We all considered that a well-written letter, well reasoned, was infinitely better than half an hour of oratory. And I fully realize your position and everybody else's that has to preside at public hearings. I have filed a brief here with 25 copies and it is a brief in every respect that the name implies. There are 2½ pages on it. I could have written 25 pages and then I do not think I would have thoroughly covered the subject. However, I have endeavored to cover the most important points.

As for my speech here or my harangue, that will be briefer still, I hope. But you know when a man gets to be my age—my friends to save my dignity, call me an octogenarian—you are apt to be rather garrulous when you get to be my age and I have to be on my guard continuously.

If I do slip here and talk longer than I ought to, if you or one of your colleagues will just raise your hand, I will cease immediately.

I am against a national seashore park in every respect. I hope that such a proposition will never go through the Congress, the House of Representatives because, if it does, it is not only my opinion, but it is to my almost certain knowledge that if this thing goes into effect, it will be the ruination not only of these lower towns on the cape but the entire cape, the other nine towns. They are most certainly badly affected for this very reason: you have been told—and I wouldn't talk about—you have been told about our entire economy on Cape Cod, what the base is and what the economy rests on. It is the value of the real estate, especially that of the nonresident taxpayer. It is a fact that these nonresident taxpayers upon which your prosperity depends and in fact, our very social existence, they pay directly 50 percent of the taxes that come into our town and that holds true in most all of the other towns.

Not only that, Madam Chairman and members, besides paying 50 percent of the taxes directly, indirectly by conservative estimate, and it is only an estimate, but a conservative estimate, they pay indirectly 85 percent of the taxes that support our town.

That is because of this: There is no other industry there and the money that they spend in improving their property and hiring labor and a thousand and one things depends upon their indirect payment of taxes.

Two of our biggest taxpayers on Cape Cod are two public utilities, the New England Telephone & Telegraph and the Cape & Vineyard Electric Co. They pay a tremendous tax. And if it were not for this exceedingly large nonresident taxpayer, the taxes they would pay would be very little because we certainly wouldn't have very many telephones; they wouldn't have many telephone customers. There would be very few people would have a telephone anyway. That right there is one of the sources of our taxation that depends on our nonresident taxpayers.

Now, Madam Chairman, I am not against public parks, national, State, or local. I am for them provided that they are located in suitable locations and also if they are sure they can be properly maintained. Now, I am sure in my own mind that this little narrow strip of land from the canal down to Provincetown, which only comprises about 400 square miles and 70,000 people dwell here on this little narrow strip of land the year round, to say nothing of as many more nonresidents in the summer and on top of that, the natural influx of tourists which come here from every State in the Union, Colorado included. I see plenty of license plates. I haven't seen an Alaska one yet, but I expect to this summer. For that reason, it is too thickly settled, altogether too little developed and to have a national park here would be disastrous because Mr. Cross has pointed out to you how we can take care of all the necessity for public beaches in our town and that holds true all the way up and down Nantucket Sound and Vineyard Sound to Woods Hole and around up to Buzzards Bay. All of the towns have provided such beaches. And we don't look with a jaundiced eye on these tourists—some call them trippers—they furnish considerable employment in a way, but they contribute very little to our tax revenue. But we have been able to take care of them all right. No one gets turned away.

All of these beaches are free and there is no need of establishing a national park here on the beach because the beach is no good. Generally speaking, very few places. So the proponents have soft-pedaled that now and they have gone back to the conservation point. It is needed here.

Here you have got to see that we take care of our historical points of interest, and all such things as that.

Now, there is no need of that because the people in every town on Cape Cod are extremely zealous of their heritage, historical heritage and every town, you can see right here in Eastham, you can see the oldest windmill there is, kept up in fine condition. It is all done by the town. That holds true in every town.

Furthermore, we have a county museum for the historical museum, and so far as I know most every town has one of their own. Our town has several. We have several large villages in the town and at least five of them have village historical museums. So, when they talk about the necessity of the National Government coming in here and taking charge of such a thing as that and assailing us for letting our historical monuments go out of existence, that is pure foolishness.

Madam Chairman, I thank you very much.

(Statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF CHESTER A. CROCKER, MARSTONS MILLS, MASS.

Mr. Chairman, and members of your committee; I hope to be able to attend your hearing in person, but owing to my advanced age (80) may not be able to do so.

First I want to express my deep appreciation of your courtesy and close attention which you extended to our delegation to your hearing in Washington last June. I am, and thousands of others are, deeply grateful to you for your courageous action in refusing to report this bill out until the coming session. We on Cape Cod are fully aware of the tremendous pressure which was brought to bear upon you to do so. Also we fully appreciate your action in coming on here and holding this hearing which, of course, you were under no legal obligation to do.

I feel deeply on this subject, and hold strong opinions backed by reason, logic, and commonsense. I feel that I am quite qualified to testify before your committee.

The town of Barnstable is the largest of the 15 towns in the county which comprises Cape Cod and I served it as selectman for 21 years (1929-1950), 19 of which I was chairman of the board of three men. During all this time I was also an assessor.

Many of the members of your committee including yourself are from the vast region we call the West. Let me remind them that under our ancient form of local government, no man can be closer to the people of his town than a selectman and to a lesser extent his county with which the towns are closely allied in a great many ways.

Over the long years I presided at innumerable public hearings in my position as chief executive officer of my town I found there were times a person holding an office of great public trust, would be actuated by ulterior motives. It would be strange if some such did not appear at your hearing here. My task was much easier than yours as the problems were purely local and my colleagues and I knew most of the witnesses.

Gentlemen, I am not opposed to public parks, National, State, or local; provided, always, they are located in suitable places and are properly maintained, supervised, and above all do not clash with their surroundings.

Cape Cod is not a suitable location for a national park; it is now an island connected with the mainland by two highway bridges and one railroad bridge, now but little used.

It is a narrow strip of land containing only about 400 square miles (I believe there are in the West ranches as large as this), but, gentlemen, 70,000 people dwell here the year round to say nothing of as many more nonresidents who own homes here to which they repair in summer for rest, quiet, and recreation. Some of these homes are palatial but the majority are more modest and comparatively few of either are located on the seashore. They patronize our public town beaches for swimming which has become the greatest kind of sport and recreation there is in the country.

The 15 towns on Cape Cod have in the aggregate many miles of fine beaches and are acquiring more every year; they cost the towns hundreds of thousands of dollars and many thousands more every year to properly maintain and supervise them which is done.

Let me say right here, it would be difficult if not impossible to discover a group of 15 towns in Massachusetts which are better governed, or their civic affairs better regulated than those on Cape Cod, including public safety, health, and adequate zoning bylaws.

We can provide for the normal increase in population, nonresident summer dwellers, two-week vacationers, and the transient tourists who we do not scorn but welcome; but, if the U.S. Government persists and succeeds in the preposterous scheme of the proponents, we will be overrun with them; real estate values which are our tax base, which supports nine-tenths of our economy, will be undermined to such an extent we will never recover and Cape Cod as we know it today will become nothing but a nostalgic memory.

The proponents of this miserable proposition, through their almost total ignorance of the true state of affairs now realize that most all of the outer beach in the area is dangerous and unfit for swimming by the public. We hear no more from them about protecting that long stretch of beach from erosion by the onslaught of the broad Atlantic Ocean; I expect the Army Engineers have informed them that it is an engineering impossibility.

They are now stressing conservation; they fear the sand dunes will be bulldozed away and covered with unsightly buildings.

What utter nonsense. As to the flora and fauna, plenty will remain there for centuries; there is nothing unique about it anyway; it can be found most anywhere along the Atlantic seaboard in this zone of latitude. They appear extremely solicitous about preserving our points of historical interest. In the name of old man Commonsense do they not know that every town on Cape Cod is extremely zealous of those very things and over the years have spent thousands upon thousands of dollars by taxation and public subscription to preserve and protect those very things.

The proponents have not brought out one single point which indicates any public necessity whatsoever.

Furthermore, they are blissfully unaware that Uncle Sam's money bag is fearfully depleted and is getting more so every day.

At this point I am impelled to say that I know of but one word which can adequately describe their estimate of the cost of their project: it is ridiculous.

Apparently they are woefully misinformed concerning land values in the locality; also, they seem to know little or nothing about the cost of laying out, improving, maintaining, and supervising a public park that is fit for public use.

I cannot bring myself to castigate too severely our two Senators and our lone Representative—a novitiate in the House—for their stand in this sorry mess. They are all honorable men of great ability and whose honesty and integrity is questioned by no intelligent citizen.

There is no known way to account for their action in this case except, that in their desire to please the administration, politics being what it is, they have taken too much for granted and failed to carefully investigate and discover the obvious truth.

Their minds were, are, and will be for a long time to come occupied with things of vast importance; many of them frightfully so.

The administration itself has been wretchedly misled by inept advisers who have been unduly influenced by educated but impractical and visionary authors and essayists who are not living in this world but in a mystical land of utopian dreams.

In our grief and distress we seek protection behind that mighty American bulwark which is erected to stand between the people and administrations and Senates when they seek to legally acquire tyranical power which they should never have in this land of freedom.

Gentlemen, I have said enough; perhaps more than enough.

Others more able than I will discover and expose for you much more of the fallacy in this amazing piece of legislative folderol. I hope you can and will prevent this bill from reaching the floor of the House until the new administration has time to study and properly evaluate the unfinished business of its predecessor.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you very much.

Dr. Madeline Winslow? Will you give your full name, please?

STATEMENT OF DR. MADELINE WINSLOW, TRURO, MASS.

Dr. Winslow. I am J. Madeline Winslow. I am a physician who hoped to retire, but instead have been retreaded. I live in the town of Truro to which I came first in 1897. It is needless for me to tell you that I love it.

Madam Chairman and members of your committee, my friends and those who are my brothers and sisters, I represent Cape Cod East Pomona Grange 35, Patrons of Husbandry, and their over 400 members. We respectfully protest the taking of land and homes for the national seashore park, as outlined.

The following factors relating to the people residing within the proposed area are submitted for your attention and consideration.

It is hoped that these factors will cause you to reconsider the taking of homes to the extent that has been proposed.

1. Loss of homes which the majority of the owners have had in the possession of their families for several generations and which have great sentimental value to the individuals.
2. If the Boland-O'Neill bill is passed, and that is the one that the Park Commission wishes to have passed, it will deprive those who accept life tenancy of their voting franchise and what red-blooded American wants to submit to that?
3. Loss of employment in the building and allied trades due to the fact that these homes would no longer be maintained by local tradesmen because these men are not unionized.
4. The loss of taxable properties to the towns concerned—thereby resulting in increased taxes for those who are not in the park.
5. Loss of income to business and farms.
6. Increase in welfare cases due to loss of employment.
7. Who is going to police this area to protect those who are forced by advanced years, like myself, to remain within the park?
8. Who is going to provide proper sanitary facilities for the hordes you propose to have come in?
9. Are the local businesses within the park going to be allowed to conduct business as usual?
10. What is to happen to the home industries when we are no longer allowed to pick the beach plums, which I have here, wild raspberries, blackberries, blueberries, rose hips, bayberries, and pine cones?

Many families supplement their incomes by picking and selling or preserving the berries and hips. The bayberries are made into candles and little pads to keep your flat iron smooth. One woman last year used 1,500 pounds of berries just to make these bags. (These were not made by her. These were made by a group of children who made them to sell at a summer fair to put money into their treasury. I am going to give them to the committee. And you will notice that one end is not very well sewn because the children are not too clever with their needles, but nevertheless, the berries are stitched close enough together to keep the cones from coming out.)

Pine cones are sold in the flower market and individuals have often cleared as much as $200. The loss of these industries means less bread in the breadbasket, less clothes to keep warm (and the winds do blow here), less time spent in school because children will be forced to work to help fill the family dinner pail. Many families have less than $1,200 per annum income. Many families in this area live on and have an income of less than $1,200 a year. It is absolutely essential they have these home industries to supplement their income.

You heard a statement made by someone yesterday about the unemployment on the cape. Very few of the people on the cape here earn enough money to be able to get unemployment compensation. The restaurants do not have a long enough season, the motels do not have a long enough season for the women who make the beds and clean rooms, the boys and girls who wash dishes are exactly in the same boat.

Comments: (1) We believe that the manner in which the survey was made, the secrecy maintained by the commission, until it was boomed at us by the newspapers, deprived us of an early protest and has not been in accord with our democratic principles. The ownership of a home is something that we as Americans hold very dear, and our Government has always fostered and nurtured this belief. Therefore, the taking of what we believe is our most cherished worldly possession should only be exacted when no other alternative exists.

(2) At the present time, if for any serious reason it is necessary to sell our homes, they are completely unmarketable. It is as if there were a lien on our properties. And if the Government does take our homes and lands there will no reasonable amount of money paid for same.

(3) The town officials have made the statements that they were not consulted until after the news bomb.

(4) The land not involved is now being bought by speculators and that is what is not wanted by the townfolks.

(5) When published the park was to be established for preservation and later changed to recreation. Where are you going to put—in this bottle—the thousands of people whom you claim will come and who is to handle the traffic problems that will develop?

(6) If the park were to be on the ocean side, taking a quarter of a mile from the shore, it would make some sense, and although there are homes and businesses there, it would not be the slaughter of the present plan.

In closing, may we say that we are not against preservation of the great outer beach. We do, however, believe that the sight of a home on the roadside or set back on a hill or plain is not obnoxious nor serves as a blight on our landscape, rather it is a symbol of the American way of life. To compel families to move from the environment of their choice unless it is of the utmost necessity should be avoided at all costs.

Now, may I speak about my exhibits? This is the way the bayberry looks as it grows in the field. It has a little yellow blossom. It belongs to the laurel family; a tiny yellow blossom which has a delightful perfume and even when you break a bit of the twig, you will get the perfume of the bay.

I will leave this with you. These are candles. To my knowledge there are only two persons who make bayberry candles commercially out of bayberry wax. Most of the candles that you buy as bayberry candles are the ordinary wax. Bayberry candle tells the truth as it gets older; like myself it gets gray. And this one is younger, this one is middle aged, and this is getting toward the same place that I am, over 70. On the end here you can see the three layers of wax as these are hand dipped. You do get them made in molds. The wax is extremely brittle. There is no particular perfume as it burns, but when you blow it out, the essence from the dying embers on the wick give you the scent of the bayberry candle. It is said on the cape that you should burn on Christmas Eve your bayberry candle to the very stump so that the following year will bring you all of the good things which our Lord intended us to have.

Here because I could not get into my cellar—I am afraid to get into it because I am 71 and rather isolated and live alone—are some samples of the jellies made from our wild fruit.

If this plan goes through we will not be able to pick any of these berries in this land any more than we can on the province lands.

I remember my own chagrin when I was ordered to drop my rose hips, but there is a little bit of the old Yankee still in me. I laid the bag down and when they left, I picked it up and took it home and made my jam. I said as my forebears would have, I will be blankety blank if they stop me.

I am leaving these jellies with you. They are the contribution of Mrs. Wiles and they are labeled. There is nothing that has the flavor of the beach plum.

I am most grateful to you for listening to me. I most certainly believe the things I have said. I am not going to live a whole lot longer, but I want to live where I want to live as long as the Lord allows me and I would like to see the small children in my neighborhood grow up in the environment in which their parents intended them to grow up. [Applause.]

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you very much, Dr. Winslow, for a very fine and very stirring statement.

Dr. WINSLOW. May I add one more thing? A statement was made yesterday that was incorrect. The town of Truro did have a special town meeting which the labor is very difficult to get. The first filing of signatures was rejected and we had to scratch around and file just under the line to have the second special town meeting at which time the voters present voted overwhelmingly against the park, and said that telegrams should be sent to Washington to express their opinion.

In Truro 850 homes, not cabins or motels, are within the park area. I am sorry but forgive me, I am getting old.

Mrs. PFOST. Our next witness is Mr. Turner.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH TURNER, COTUIT, MASS.

Mr. TURNER. Madam Chairman and members of your committee, and Hon. Hastings Keith. I wish to thank you very much for your great consideration in permitting this hearing on Cape Cod so that we may attempt to express our differing views on this proposed national park. I beg your pardon, I guess I should give my name. My name is Kenneth Turner and I live in Cotuit, in the town of Barnstable. I hope this committee will be a little bit tolerant as I am a little bit upset. I have a sick child at home. My home has suffered severe damages from this recent storm.

Such views as I may try to express on the proposed national seashore park or any other subject can only be those of a Cape Codder as this has always been my home and that of many generations of my ancestors before me. It would be most hard indeed for me to acquire a viewpoint apart from inbred customs and traditions and love for this little neck of land that protrudes into the Atlantic Ocean.

To me the proposed national park is wrong in either concept. I think it is totally wrong in the proposed manner of accomplishment.

It involves in essence tremendous change imposed upon a rather helpless minority of peaceful minded citizens pursuing their own cherished way of life. It would seem as though if we are to honor our promises of freedom abroad, we must first avoid the pitfalls of dissension and oppression at home.

We must be ever wary of the fact that forced salvation runs but a short span ahead of the despair and subjugation that comes of a philosophy that our Nation is dedicated to destroy.

The basic element of democracy is contained in the right of a free electorate to vote upon important issues that pertain to its welfare. We must not lose sight of this principle, pressures or no pressures. Nor should we overlook that the fundamentals of our capitalistic economy are based on free enterprise. Is the specter of exploitation by private enterprise greatly worse than the prospect of arbitrary directives by a centralized authority?

We are advised that we must acquire more and more public lands for recreational purposes. Yet Russia is virtually all public lands, and are the inhabitants any happier? Almost the entire great area of Alaska is Government owned, yet there was opposition to deny the remaining small segment the right of statehood.

It has been stated by former Attorney General Francis Biddle that the purposes of recreation and conservation are nearly irreconcilable, and that both cannot exist at the same place at the same time. Yet the differing views of the several sponsors promise just that. The fate of the prized heath would surely follow that of the clams.

Your committee may have concluded from firsthand observation that the conquest of the Atlantic Ocean to preserve the outer shores of Cape Cod could fittingly follow the conquest of space. This mighty ocean builds and tears down its own barriers at will.

The conservation that would seem best for Cape Cod would be to allow it to preserve its rights to its homes and its lands and its freedom, and to let it provide for the widely acclaimed needs of recreational facilities under its own jurisprudence. That is the main business of Cape Cod and we must do it well and I believe are doing it well.

I would like to state once more that I feel that this park program is poorly conceived. I feel it would be disastrous to Cape Cod and I feel that the people of this community have not had a fair chance to express their opinion. I feel that the issue is vital to the welfare of a long-established community and should be put before the people and that they should have the right to vote upon it, that this is not a matter to be settled in private conclave, and I sincerely hope that your committee will report unfavorably upon this matter.

Thank you.

(Statement of Mr. Turner follows:)

COTUIT, MASS., *December 12, 1960.*

HON. GRACIE PFOST,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. care of Board of Selectmen. Eastham, Mass.

DEAR MRS. PFOST: It is fitting to thank you and the other members of your committee for your real interest in granting this public hearing in Eastham. You have come a long way to listen to an anxious minority group of free citizens whose welfare and peace and manner of living would be so violently affected by the establishment of the proposed national seashore park on Cape Cod.

Last June more than 50 highly respected, accomplished, and loyal citizens of the Cape from Buzzards Bay to Provincetown had signed a petition in protest of this proposed park. This petition was presented to the House Committee on Interior Affairs in Washington, D.C., about June 20. There is little indication that the views and convictions of these men have changed, despite numerous programs of enlightenment proffered by the State and National Park Services to present this measure as a national crisis. There is disagreement among the sponsors as to whether the purposes of the bill should be for recreation or conservation. A former attorney general has observed that the two purposes are nearly irreconcilable.

This park program was never asked for by the cape inhabitants, nor was the measure originally conceived by any of its present sponsors who with the exception of Representative Hastings Keith have never shown the slightest concern as to the judgment and wishes of a heretofore helpless minority to defend their rights to their homes, their lands, and their identity as a democratic community. The sponsors have never chosen to suggest nor to risk a free vote of sentiment on this issue on Cape Cod. The theme of inevitability is no palliative for the surrender of land and homes and jurisdiction, nor does compromise provide the right answer. No mandate has come forth from Cape Cod for this proposed park. The measure involves most serious and irrevocable commitments.

The town of Provincetown is at present fighting hard to regain a small living room part of the province lands, long ago dedicated to public use. The town of Falmouth is in a death struggle to save its essential municipal airport from authoritative consignment as an animal refuge. The helpless citizens of Forestdale dwell in fear of eviction from their homes. Yet we are heavily taxed to guarantee freedom and security abroad.

The manner of growth under universally adopted zoning laws on the cape is largely invested within the individual communities which surely recognize that our main source of wealth and income is contained in the preservation of our natural resources. This awareness is being constantly demonstrated by the conservation measures adopted by our various towns.

The State of Massachusetts now offers financial and planning assistance to its communities to aid them in the preservation of their marshlands and beaches, with no sacrifice of local jurisdiction nor the right to expand their living areas, nor the seizure of private homes and privileges. The Federal Government may soon follow this same orderly democratic procedure.

Private ownership, along with local control of our public shorefront properties, has preserved our waterfront areas from becoming a shambles. It is doubtful if remote directives of a centralized authority could do any better.

Two expert economic surveys forebode terrific harmful impacts on our economy, and the sponsors themselves have advised a costly continuing county defense plan to counteract the effects of the creation of the proposed park.

Our present national debt of around $400 billion is enough without adding perhaps another $100 million worth of unsolved problems, complexities, and imponderables which are inseparable to the plan.

The members of your committee must recognize the finality and the injustice of imposing such vast changes upon one of the first footholds of democracy without giving its citizens even a chance to vote upon this vital issue. It would be a tragedy to regard 3 centuries of pioneering and homebuilding and customs and rights as expendable in the cause of selfish demands for recreation.

I firmly hope that your committee will elect to report unfavorably upon this proposed national seashore park on Cape Cod.

Very truly yours,

KENNETH TURNER.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you.

Reverend E. B. Luscombe is our next witness.

STATEMENT OF REV. E. B. LUSCOMBE, WELLFLEET, MASS.

Mr. LUSCOMBE. Madam Chairman and members of the committee and Mr. Keith, may I make a few brief informatory remarks? I would like to give you just briefly a bit of my background. I am not a stranger to the Cape by any means, although I cannot claim to be a Cape Codder. If I tried to do that I would be most unorthodox and

I do not know what they would do to me. However, I was born in the city of New Bedford, which is sometimes referred to as the Gateway to the Cape, and I have some distant relatives among them, so they can't altogether disown me.

Incidentally, my background in terms of the sea is also very similar because my two grandfathers were connected with the old whaling industry.

Now, I am the pastor of the Wellfleet and Eastham Methodist churches. I am quite conversant with the area in which there is a proposal to establish what is called the Cape Cod National Seashore Park. This area is fairly populous with homes, some of them summer, but many of them the homes of our people who live here the year round. The area has many side roads, especially in Eastham and Wellfleet, with Route 6 as their only entrance and exit. These facts make the proposal to establish a national park an extremely dangerous matter and one that should be studied with meticulous care and the most detailed scrutiny.

Indeed, considering these facts, the establishment of a national park or any other recreational type park in this area could well be destructive rather than preservative of it. We may, therefore, consider with profit the practically certain effects that such a park would have in the towns of Eastham, Wellfleet, and Truro or in similar towns.

National parks are designed to attract tourists with various recreational devices. During the summer, tourists come into this area in great numbers, in fact, about all that can be handled according to the requirements of highway safety and general enjoyment of the area.

The lower cape is not a wilderness with vast amounts of acreage such as one may find in the Far West or in many other parts of the country. The widest part of the lower cape north of Orleans is less than 5 miles. The establishment of a national park here would in all likelihood increase the number of tourists to such astronomical proportions as to constitute a nuisance to the people who live here and perhaps even a menace to their safety, which would also involve the safety of the tourists themselves.

If I may interject a moment. We have had some serious accidents out on this highway that can't by any means be minimized. We lost one of the finest young girls of my church not too long ago as a result of a highway accident.

This area is far too close to metropolitan populations. Moreover, Route 6 has 23 miles of two-lane highway and approximately 13 miles of three-lane highway. This latter section runs from North Eastham to North Truro, is marked only with broken lines, lends itself to speed, and under heavy traffic is dangerous to say the least.

Much of it skirts the proposed park and some of it is in it. The establishment of a park with a tourist emphasis would mean the building of motels, the erasing of scenic beauty for parking areas, the setting up of picnic grounds and camping sites, the establishment of restaurants and refreshment stands. Then with thousands of people crowding this narrow strip of land, the end result would not be preservation but destruction.

There is further a definite moral question. Nothing in the proposed bills prohibits the sale or use of intoxicants within the park boundaries. We could therefore expect an increase of drinking in this area, creating a further nuisance and adding to the dangers of the highway.

The people who come here to live do so because they like the scenic beauty, the peace and quiet. A national park would tend to be destructive of this. Is this fair to the people who live here, some of them are natives with their cape ancestry going back to 200 or 300 years? The answer is obviously "No," for under the conditions as outlined above, the quaint charm and scenic beauty of this part of the cape would be for the most part destroyed.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you, Mr. Luscombe. [Applause.]

Our next witness is Mr. Victor F. Adams.

STATEMENT OF VICTOR F. ADAMS, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF SELECTMEN, BARNSTABLE, MASS.

Mr. Adams. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, Congressman Keith, my name is Victor F. Adams. I was born in the village of Osterville on Cape Cod, and, with the exception of a few years spent off the cape getting an education and teaching, I have spent my entire life here. I was elected a full-time selectman and assessor in the town of Barnstable in March 1933, have served continuously since then, and have been for some years the chairman of the board of selectmen. I have been the president of both the Massachusetts Selectmen's Association and the Association of Massachusetts Assessors. I believe that by virtue of my lifelong residence on Cape Cod and my years in public office, I am perhaps better qualified to judge the effects of the establishment here of a national park than would be the average person.

I should probably state at the outset that I am opposed to this scheme. It is difficult for me to understand why so many Cape Codders who know that the national park would be very bad for Cape Cod have not actually registered vigorous opposition. Perhaps they feel that the establishment of the park is inevitable and that, therefore, they should not waste their time in registering opposition but rather spend it in bargaining for the best deal they can get.

I am sure that at previous hearings and through communications to your committee practically all the arguments against the establishment of a national park already have been advanced. I certainly will not waste your time by repeating what has already been said, except in respect to what seems to me to be the crux of the entire matter.

What I have to say will be based on the theme that if through the establishment of a national park Cape Cod is made available to the entire country, its attractions will cease to exist for those Cape Codders and "summer people" who now enjoy it. By "summer people" I mean those who spend all or a considerable portion of the summer in homes they have purchased, in houses they rent or in accommodations at hotels or motels.

To almost any other area, a national park might well give local business quite a shot in the arm, but here on Cape Cod it would be seriously, if not fatally, detrimental to our economy. I doubt if there is any existing national park where the economy and general character of the surrounding area is at all like that of Cape Cod.

Here on the peninsula or island, as you prefer, we have an almost unique situation. Over half of our taxes are paid by nonresidents, most of whom own summer homes. They expect and get very little for the taxes they pay. Many others rent cottages or relatively expensive accommodations at hotels or motels. They give impetus to all the building trades; they hire many people on the places and spend large sums in local stores.

In short, they become the backbone of the economy of Cape Cod and have been for perhaps as long as 50 years. There is every reason to believe that this situation should continue on most of the cape indefinitely, if we properly manage our affairs.

Will the establishment of a Cape Cod National Park encourage this kind of growth, and is it going to encourage our "summer people" to stay with us and the normal number of new ones to come in? The answer is obvious. When our rather quiet village streets and our beaches become crowded, when our bays and ponds develop traffic problems, when a moderate amount of seclusion and privacy is no longer possible, then the quaintness, the charm, the attraction of the cape will be gone for the kind of people who have meant so much to it for so long. Our unusual prosperity was built up not by large numbers of summer visitors of limited means, but by relatively small numbers of rather wealthy people.

The national park, we are told, is going to increase manifold the number of summer visitors. If this is so, even places as remote as my own town of Barnstable are going to be adversely affected.

Within the limits of the proposed park, safe beaches are very limited in area. Since bathing is what many people come here for, they will crowd other cape beaches to an extent that is likely to become uncomfortable, if not intolerable. Large volumes of traffic will inevitably spill out onto roads other than Route 6 aggravating traffic problems where they now exist, creating new ones and ending forever the seclusion that many areas now enjoy. Our bays, harbors, and lakes may very well suffer from similar traffic hazards created by swarms of small boats operated for the most part by inexperienced people.

Now, let's consider those who are principally sightseers. What are these folks going to see when they arrive at the cape park—sand dunes and seashore? We have very little to offer the sightseer as compared to many other national parks. By contrast, at other parks most visitors appreciate and are thrilled by the majesty and beauty of the mountains and the wonders of nature which exist elsewhere. Only a few, I believe, have the artistic temperament to fully appreciate the beauty of the sand dunes and the sea. I submit also that the dunes are no longer attractive when swarms of people are climbing over them, and this is likely to happen and difficult to prevent, from a conservation point of view.

However, if the national park is not established and if subsequently the area is badly developed and no substantial part of it made available to the public, all will not be lost.

At the next annual town meeting, the town of Barnstable will complete the acquisition of what is known as Sandy Neck. This is a finger of upland about 6 miles long and containing several square miles lying between Barnstable Harbor and the great marshes on the south and Massachusetts Bay on the north.

It consists mainly of sand dunes, interspersed with spots of low-growing vegetation and small trees, including many beautiful hollies. It is every bit as beautiful as the proposed park area. We intend to preserve it for posterity in its natural state, so that those who have the capacity to appreciate unspoiled sand dunes and beach areas will have the opportunity. We intend also to acquire several square miles of the adjacent great marshes for conservation purposes.

I will venture to say, gentlemen, that these areas will be better preserved than will a national park, if we have one. I say this because I know that our local town will exercise much more effective control over an area within its own borders than will any personnel, however conscientious, directed by a Government agency 500 miles away, which may or may not have adequate funds.

In conclusion, may I say that Cape Cod is being visited by more and more people each year. Our growth is fully as rapid as it should be, without any help from a national park. If such is established here, it will no doubt provide over the years transient enjoyment for millions of people who would not otherwise have the pleasure. Certainly most of them would lead just as happy lives if they spent their vacation elsewhere, while the harm done to this region would be out of all proportion to the benefits derived by others. It would be the beginning of the end of the cape as we oldtimers have known it.

We have here a way of life enjoyed and lived by natives and "summer people" alike, a way of life unsurpassed elsewhere. It cannot coexist with a national park. With the utmost sincerity, may I urge that you consider well before you plant the seeds of its destruction. [Applause.]

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you very much, Mr. Adams.

Mr. Walcott Ames is our last witness with this group.

STATEMENT OF WALCOTT AMES, PRESIDENT, BARNSTABLE COUNTY NATIONAL BANK, HYANNIS, MASS.

Mr. Ames. Madam Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, Hon. Congressman Keith. I haven't any prepared statement here. I am going to take but just a minute.

First, I want to say right off that I am vehemently opposed to this so-called proposition of taking this area and creating a park. The gentleman behind me says you would probably like to know who I am. Well, I am not much. In the first place, I was born on Cape Cod, and my father and grandfather before me. Perhaps I should mention that I spent all of my life here except 2 years when I was in the First World War. I did have occasion to fly down over the park at Hatteras several times. I am not going to say but little because it is repetitious.

I would like to bring out one thing, and first I heard Judge Chenoweth yesterday ask Mr. Foster who handles the Massachusetts parks, to a certain extent, why the State hasn't taken the parks? His answer was it would cost too much. Let me just refresh the memory of some who know that about 4 or 5 years ago the State of Massachusetts had a hearing in the State House at which time efforts were made to have the State acquire this area you have here now, in addition the Sandy Neck area that the previous speaker just spoke about. There was also a large area in the village of Marstons Mills, highly valuable area.

At any rate, it was all thrown out. I believe Mr. Foster made a remark the State couldn't afford it. If the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with its heavy debt, one of the heaviest debts in the Union of about a billon dollars is so far in debt it can't afford it, how can the United States with $290 billion debt afford it? When I speak of these figures, my background here, I happen to be president of the bank in Hyannis, and we have perhaps 40 or 45 employes, an $8 or $10 million company. I see the economy of the cape come and go, grow.

I see so many tradesmen here who are dependent upon the houses that are occupied by some of our so-called summer residents and I question very much how you are going to do anything other than hurt our economic growth that is taking place here. I have fished up and down these beaches 40 or 50 times. I have a beach wagon. I fish from Wood End around to Race Point, Highland Light, down to Pamet River, down to Nauset Lighthouse, come into Orleans along down the beach right into Monomoy. I have very rarely seen anybody in there swimming, very rare. We do see people lying on the beach occasionally. I do not think to take this for recreational purposes that many people can use it for swimming. The water is very cold; the surf is very high.

I might, incidentally, mention to your people, I see in one of your reports that Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard were mentioned. Both of these places have one of the finest beaches, warm water, level beach, no high surf to interfere. So if you want a beach for recreational purposes Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard both offer something beyond anything we have here. I notice that the towns have provided parking areas, toilet facilities, police protection, they have managed these little beaches around there very well, and as they grow and there has been need for more they have acquired them and spent money on them. I think that the local government has done a mighty fine job and I believe if you people will leave these beaches alone, they will continue to do so.

I could take a lot of your time, but I want to say one more thing, that you people, in all of my 60 years of being here are one of the first Federal committees I have ever seen to take interest enough to put themselves out to come down here and hear our side of the story.

Thank you, all of you.

(Mr. Ames' letter follows:)

THE BARNSTABLE COUNTY NATIONAL BANK,
HYANNIS, MASS., *December 12, 1960.*

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I wish to be recorded opposed to House bill No. 9050 (national seashore park) for the following reasons:

First: The cost of purchasing this property alone is staggering. There, undoubtedly, would be many claims before finally getting the actual cost down in black and white and the cost to the taxpayers will only compound the initial cost.

Second: I was born here on the cape 60-odd years ago and I have driven up and down the outside beach and also visited along the upland many times all the way from Nauset Point to Race Point at different times of the year, and I have observed that no one uses the beach for bathing purposes because of the undercurrent, high surf and cold water.

Third: The area if made into a park (and I do not know what your idea of a park would be even though I have heard several conflicting stories as to what you propose to do to create a park, so-called) would only be used at the most 2 months out of the year, and I assume, that would be by people parking in cars or living in tents and possibly cottages which you may propose to build.

Of course, some people would be on the beach; however, all the towns now provide public beaches and supervise them. In some cases the towns have enlarged their parking areas and beach facilities if the demand was sufficient. Just how do you feel the public would benefit by Federal management over local management? It certainly will cost the taxpayers more money, as most of the towns now employ school teachers to supervise the beaches; whereas, the Federal Government will undoubtedly have year-round employees.

I would suggest that you look at a map of Cape Cod and see the areas that are now owned by the Federal Government, by our State government and by our local towns. You will find the area is vast. So, why do you really need any more? In fact, why don't you do more toward developing Monomoy Point, for instance.

I think you will agree there is every reason for our local town governments to properly supervise and provide all the beaches needed, both now and in the future as our resort business represents about 75 to 80 percent of Cape Cod's income.

The above reasons for my being opposed to this bill are but a few of the many.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

WALCOTT AMES.

Mrs. PFOST. I should like to ask you, Mr. Cross, if you wish to have the resolution adopted at the Barnstable Town Hall placed in the record and appended to your statement.

Mr. CROSS. Yes, Madam Chairman, I would. (Committee Note: The resolution referred to appears on p. 125.)

Mrs. PFOST. How much time do you need, Mr. Cummings?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Not over 5 minutes.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you; will you proceed?

STATEMENT OF PRESCOTT B. CUMMINGS, CHAIRMAN, PLANNING BOARD, EASTHAM, MASS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, I am Prescott Cummings, chairman of the Eastham Planning Board.

We were told that at this hearing you didn't want to hear any repetition of the brief that we had filed in the 1959 hearings here and the June hearings in Washington. So we have made a very short statement which is really an appendix to the statement that we filed in Washington and here in 1959.

At the December 9, 1959, committee hearings in Eastham, the Eastham Planning Board went on record as being unanimously opposed to a national park within the boundaries of this town. The planning board still feels that a national park would be economically and esthetically highly detrimental to the town. We, therefore, strongly recommend no park.

We would like to point out that there have been two economic surveys made, both showing conclusively that to exist the entire State highway would have to turn into a highly commercialized service area to the park. This condition, along with the highly objectionable uses now allowed within a national park such as motels, cabins, restaurants, gasoline stations, chain grocery stores, and liquor establishments, would defeat the very purpose of the park and all that this town has worked for.

The proponents of this bill have stated that, in objection to a national park, they are only interested in hard cold facts and figures though they have presented only too few themselves. We feel that other than the two economic surveys that have been made, their entire case is based on theory, hopes, and such vague statements that we feel sure that the National Park Service will not allow this objectionable use, and we hope that the Park Service will change its policies to accommodate everyone; and that though a national park has never been established under such circumstances and in so highly developed an area, we believe everything will turn out all right. This is only hopes and theory with no past experience in such an area and a complete disregard for the consequences.

The Planning Board of Eastham presents the following facts:

The physical location of Eastham should be carefully noted. Were a park to be established, the town would be an extremely small area by park standards. On the north it would be separated from the rest of the park by Camp Wellfleet, a military installation in a highly strategic location. On the south, the area would be separated from the town-owned beaches of Orleans by about 6 miles of highway and the town of Orleans. Should the town of Orleans refuse to give its beaches to the park—and this is highly probable—it would then be over 12 miles to the Chatham beaches. Eastham is then a small, segregated, highly developed and very costly area.

Following are two statements made by the Director of National Parks in an article in the Saturday Evening Post:

> Some camping grounds are so crowded that they amount to outdoor slums. Yellowstone will be destroyed if things keep on as they are going, literally destroyed, crowds walking all over the formations, vandalism is more and more prevalent. We ought to at least keep what we've got and we're not doing it.

We feel that these statements based on real facts show that conservation and preservation could not possibly exist in so small a place as the proposed Eastham area, if it were wide open to millions of visitors and under the auspices of the National Park Service.

A survey made by three local persons all in the building or real estate business has shown that the fair market value of the proposed park area in Eastham based on recent sales and construction costs would be over $15 millions. This figure does not include the great marsh. This amounts to over $4,600 per acre including land and buildings, an unheard of price in establishing a national park.

Only a very few people have said that they would want to remain in a park. The great majority feel that it would be unbearable to live in a recreational area. This would require the Park Service to expend large sums for purchase of property from the outset.

It should be noted that besides a building code and a conservation commission, the town of Eastham has an excellent entire town zoning that we understand is comparable to what the National Park Service would like within the area. Route 6 is zoned for only two business and one permissive use area and the town is currently considering the new Historical Sites Acts allowing control of building design in these areas so as to maintain appropriate architecture. In recent years it has been the policy of the town to retain for historical and recreational uses appropriate property acquired by tax title and purchase.

The town now maintains two public beaches on the ocean and for future public use as needed has approximately 50 acres and 3,100 feet of beach area. There are adequate yearly appropriations for care of the beaches, lifeguards, et cetera.

The selectmen and the planning board are at present working on a plan to acquire in the name of the town the entire Great Marsh and the dunes and beaches south of the Coast Guard Beach and to hold them for the public forever for fishing, shell fishing, swimming, boating, et cetera.

The town of Eastham now offers the public all of the above uses, recreation, conservation, and preservation at no cost to the Government and no charge to the public.

Except for the previously mentioned objectionable uses allowed by the National Park Service, it is clearly evident that the town of Eastham is already doing all of the desirable things for the public that this bill envisions, and that any bill for a national park in Eastham would not only be superfluous, but very costly to both the town and the Government and would defeat its own purposes.

Should, regardless of all valid arguments against it, a national park be established, we feel that it is imperative that the property owner within the area be fully protected. A section should be included in the bill requiring that sufficient funds be immediately available for the purchase of any properties that the owners wish to sell to the National Park Service and that the Park Service be required to purchase such property within 1 year from the date of request by the owner. This would alleviate the hardship for those persons who feel they must sell for whatever reason. As this park is to be established for all of the Nation to use, it should be paid for by the people and not at the cost of the property owners.

We are particularly concerned with the aforementioned objectionable uses. In a tentative statement of policy by the National Park Service, it states that concession development that would compete with private enterprise would not be introduced within the park. Because of this tentative statement of policy, we feel there can be no objection by the National Park Service to a section reading:

> The following uses shall not be allowed within the park area: motels, hotels, cabins, restaurants, gasoline stations, grocery stores, curio and gift shops, and the sale of liquor.

Thank you.

Mrs. Pfost: Thank you, Mr. Cummings. [Applause.]

That completes the presentation of group three. The presentations have required an hour and 12 minutes. We still have four groups to be heard from. We do have a plane to catch and we are rather hopeful we will not be "no-shows."

I shall ask again. Mr. Cross, I will ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted at the Barnstable Town Hall be placed in the record. Is there objection?

Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Are there questions of the group of witnesses?

Mr. Ullman. Madam Chairman, I would just like to commend the witnesses. Being strongly in opposition to a park, sometimes witnesses are not as well restrained in some other areas as you folks have been and we appreciate the restraint with which you have testified here.

Mrs. PFOST. Are there further observations or questions of the witnesses?

If not, thank you very much, each and every one of you. We do appreciate your statements and we are very happy that you had an opportunity to appear this morning though we realize that you had hoped to appear yesterday.

Will the next group of witnesses come forward? They all come from Provincetown: Josephine Del Deo, Miriam DeWitt, Ross Moffett, Jack Tworkov, Mrs. M. R. Werner.

Will you proceed, Josephine Del Deo?

STATEMENT OF JOSEPHINE DEL DEO, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mrs. PFOST. State your full name for the record?

Mrs. DEL DEO. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, Representative Keith and members of the audience, my name is Josephine Del Deo and I am a resident of Provincetown. I have been living there as a year-round citizen for a period of 10 years. From 1950 to 1955, I operated a shop selling handwoven materials which I made myself. For the past 7 years, my husband has run a very successful restaurant in Provincetown. We are now completing a home which we built ourselves and we have every intention of living in Provincetown the rest of our lives. I consider my two children fortunate to have been born in this part of America and I am here today to make a personal plea to your committee to help those of us who love and cherish this land to protect and keep it forever as a truly special part of the world.

I emphasize my tenure on the cape and the nature of my residency, solely to establish in your minds the fact that there are many, many persons and families, who live here as we do, who do not favor the dismembering of the proposed national park.

There has been a constant propaganda on the part of town officials of the lower cape, in particular, to the effect that all those opposed to local schemes of real estate speculation and short-term expansion programs are "outsiders and do-gooders," and in general, people whose main portion of the workyear is spent so far from the cape that they could not possibly know what is good for their respective communities.

The inference which follows this premise is that only those citizens born, bred and brought up on Cape Cod with ancestral roots in our sandy soil can qualify to recommend legislation, or understand the local interests of the people.

Since I have lived here I have noticed that the reverse is often the case. It is the citizens with the family tree that are exploiting the land of their heritage and the later arrivals who have tried to save it. I think we should all recognize that this kind of propaganda is a deliberate smokescreen and that the real test of a man's qualifications for a job is not the length of time he has had it, but the intelligence and enthusiasm with which he serves it.

When John Snow, chairman of the Provincetown Board of Selectmen, spoke at the Washington Senate hearings on the park last June, he began his statement by saying, "Now, I am not a planner, I am a lawyer. I am also a town official and I am a Cape Codder." It might be well to point out to the committee that Mr. Snow is also a real estate agent and if he does not boast of being a planner, he might do well to incorporate planning in his list of attributes as chairman of the board of selectmen.

He approached the committee at that time with several proposals. The first was a matter of the request by Provincetown to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to acquire from the State, roughly half or about 1,400 acres of the province lands. This proposal was introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature early in the summer, and fortunately, was defeated.

A second bill, H.R. 3290, was put forth which asked for approximately 700 acres of the same province lands, an area which constitutes the very heart of our most heavily wooded and scenic landscape. I am sure this committee has had the land I speak of pointed out to them, or at least is familiar with it on the map. Although it may not seem an unreasonable amount of land to keep out of the park, it is the location and quality of this land which is important.

It would be a highly desirable area to include in the national park for it contains many of our loveliest little ponds, beech groves, and foot paths. Since 1893, these province lands have been considered by the Commonwealth to be a public park under the jurisdiction of the department of public works. This has been clearly pointed out by Representative Allen Jones, assistant Republican floor leader in the Massachusetts House of Representatives, who stated recently in a letter to me—

> As you probably know, the province lands were purchased from the Indians in the area of 1654 and in 1893, the legislature provided that these lands should be a park for the people of the Commonwealth, because of the unique character of the lands.

I beg to propose if this land is so highly valued by Massachusetts for scenic and recreational purposes, then it should also be valued by our Federal Government for the same purposes.

In conclusion, the feeling in Provincetown has been so strong against the taking of these lands that petitions and letters to the Massachusetts Legislature have served to stop the second bill from passage. It is our sincere hope that pressures will be sufficient, or that the Cape Cod National Seashore Park will be passed in time to save this land for the people of the United States.

Persons who are of my opinion, have been and will be accused of opposing progress, of denying others the right to a decent piece of property on which to build a home, and of cutting off our fellow citizens from economic opportunities.

I have examined my conscience many times as I have driven through the one badly overcrowded area in our town and asked myself if I am helping to deny those people an opportunity to better their situation by recommending that the lines of the national park be established as originally planned. The answer is "No," for several reasons: firstly, there is already ample room within the existing township of Provincetown for new homes to be built. And I would like to refer the committee here to item 2 in a letter written to Senator John Powers, president of the Massachusetts Senate, dated September 26, 1960, by local taxpayers which amply covers this subject.

Some of this land has not been properly assessed and a large portion of it is owned by a few individuals who have held it for some time, probably in lieu of more profitable use. I think I may safely state here that the land that would be acquired from the province lands is certain of being turned over to a developer, one such has already been named by our town manager, and will not afford the individual residential homeseeker much choice. He will be forced to buy land back from the developer at his price and I presume these prices will not be overly modest. I cannot see much in this project except for the type of motel units and resort attractions that we already have a superfluity of and which will be built and run by the same people who already own the motels and resort attractions. There is not much here for a poor man crowded into a 50- by 30-foot lot.

Secondly, there is the very important item of providing work for the towns in the construction industry. Of course, this cannot be denied. Selectman Frazier of Wellfleet has compiled a very imposing list of facts and figures on this subject. He points out the large amount of Wellfleet economics which leans on building expansion. Naturally, it is foolish to deny that business expansion will be cut by the national park. It is exactly for this reason that the park is being established.

The only question is, at what point and where should we curtail appetites of land developers? It is important to remember, as the economic report on the park bill pointed out, that construction will run out eventually anyway. If it runs out in this generation instead of three generations from now, then we have sacrificed, it is true, but many generations of Americans after us will benefit by our loss.

I think it is irrelevant to point out that zoning laws will restrict private development. Zoning laws will protect only so long as they cannot be changed and changes are easy enough to institute through private pressures from one administration to another in the local town meetings. However, changes in the Federal rulings will be much harder to come by and therefore, the land will be much better protected in the long run under a national park.

Lastly, the question of what is progress must be met squarely. Progress does not mean simply a steady advance forward regardless of circumstances. It means, according to Webster, to advance forward and increase in proficiency. To recommend the taking of the province lands in Provincetown will not increase our proficiency for reasons I have shown, but it will increase our tax rate. It will destroy a valuable section of land which should belong to the national seashore park, and it will go down in the annals of our history as one of the land grabs which contributed to the emasculation of a noble effort to create a unique park on Cape Cod for American citizens.

Madam Chairman, and members of the committee, I urge you to give this matter your immediate attention and to exert all possible speed in voting the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park into reality.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you, Mrs. Del Deo.

Our next witness is Miriam DeWitt.

Mrs. DeWitt. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to speak in behalf of the national seashore park. I have a prepared statement which I would like to submit for the record, and I will just give a brief summary.

Mrs. PFOST. Have you presented it to the committee already?

Mrs. DEWITT. Yes, I have.

Mrs. PFOST. Without objection, the statement will be made a part of the record.

(Statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. MIRIAM HAPGOOD DEWITT, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

I am in favor of H.R. 9050 to establish a Cape Cod National Seashore park. Selectmen of several lower Cape Cod towns have proposed drastic changes in the boundaries set forth in this bill. These changes would cut out many of the park's most beautiful and valuable sections. I oppose these shortsighted attempts to dismember the park.

Such wholesale boundary changes are undesirable from every point of view. The park is already small for a national park. If these revisions are permitted to cut up the park, the remaining area would be a crazy quilt that would be impossible to administer effectively. Far more important, such a shredded piece of land would frustrate the chief aim of the park, namely, conservation. The boundaries were chosen, only after careful consideration, with this end in view. Moreover, the people who now live in the areas that would be excluded from the park would forfeit the rural charm of their surroundings when the time came for the subdivider and his bulldozer to clatter up their narrow, winding roads. The towns would in large measure lose their greatest economic asset—the beauty and historic character of this land and of these old communities. The people of the Nation would lose a unique landscape. A few people, it is true, would turn a dollar.

These areas are not needed for expansion. Present park boundaries leave to the towns all the space they will require in the foreseeable future. They do not need unlimited acreage in which to spread out over the hills and seashores. Such so-called growth merely drives away the visitors who form the backbone of the region's economy. The towns can continue to grow and prosper within a restricted area if they plan to make the best use of their natural and historic features. Scattering of houses is bad conservation, bad aesthetics and bad economics.

Although the whole small area of the lower Cape should be thought of and planned for as a whole, I should like to confine the remainder of my statement to the Provincetown end, where my husband and I are voters and taxpayers, and where our memories go back to early childhood. I can still see the old town, with the harbor on one side and the woods and dunes on the other, as it looked nearly half a century ago, when my father first brought his family there for the summer. My parents took part in the revival that made this little town internationally famous as a cultural center. The Provincetown Players put on their first play in our house and my mother and father wrote and acted one of the early plays produced in the old fishhouse on Mary Vorse's wharf. That same summer Eugene O'Neill's first production, "Bound East for Cardiff," was played on the wharf to the sound of waves, with the harbor in the background.

Only a few years after our arrival, my husband's family spent the first of a long series of summers—and many winters—there. They followed in the footsteps of an uncle, who had discovered the town in the 1890's and was one of the first artists to settle in Provincetown. Although my husband and I have lived in many places, Provincetown is home for us and our two sons.

I bring in this bit of family history because some of my opponents on this issue claim to speak with more authority because they were born there. They say no one "from away" can know what is best for the town. But they are there by accident, while we come by choice, often from far away. We come for the special things Provincetown has to offer: unspoiled woods, dunes and ocean beach, and, side by side, the historic life of the harbor and the bustling cultural life of the town. Many native Provincetowners agree with us that to spread houses and motels over the wild back country that has always been in the public domain would destroy the Provincetown we love.

Annexation by the town of a belt of woods and ponds (part of the State-owned province lands) that separates and protects the town from the shifting sand dunes is being vigorously promoted by a small group of town officials and businessmen. Without prior public discussion or a thorough study of the consequences, they had a bill introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature to cede these State lands to the town. It had already passed the lower house and was due to be acted upon by the senate before the people of Provincetown knew what was happening. When the extent and location of the lands to be taken and the plans for development were belatedly published, they were greeted with a storm of criticism. There is a widespread feeling that if this land is developed, the people of Provincetown will be trading a priceless part of their heritage for a mess of pottage.

Present plans call for building on these province lands several motels, a shopping center, an 18-hole golf course and over 400 homes. Proponents argue that the town needs more land so that Provincetown's young families can build their homes there instead of moving to Wellfleet and Truro. They say that additional land is needed to provide facilities for the influx of tourists that will be attracted by the park. They claim that by thus broadening the tax base, taxes will be lowered. On the contrary, the great cost of developing this difficult land would almost certainly put its price beyond the reach of local young people, while tax increases that would undoubtedly follow to cover the high cost of services for such a large and scattered development would drive still more of them away.

Town Manager Lawrence has acknowledged that the land would cost so much to develop that local enterprises could not do the job. It would have to be developed by an out-of-town syndicate, which would reap the profits of the operation. Vast sums would indeed be required to clear the land, build the roads over sand and peat marsh, dredge the shallow lakes and fill the bogs, build water mains, import hundreds of tons of loam for the golf course and plant grass and other cover to hold the sand—this last no easy job, as Provincetowners know from long experience.

After all this expenditure, Provincetown might find itself in a bad financial squeeze. Golf courses do not pay for themselves in taxes, nor do most homes. As several studies have borne out, most residential developments are not self-supporting. The ones that pay enough taxes to cover the cost of services are $25,000 to $50,000 houses on half-acre to acre lots. If such a squeeze did develop, the town would be forced to change its present plans and permit much more commercial construction in the area at the cost of still more of the special character that now draws people to Provincetown.

There is no need for the town to embark upon such a hazardous adventure. Within the present boundaries of the town there is still a large acreage of developable land, that, with good planning, could provide many housing units and commercial facilities at far lower cost to build and maintain. They would meet the town's needs for a long time to come. Provincetown does not have to lodge all of the tourists who would visit that end of the park. There is ample space elsewhere within easy driving distance.

It seems clear that the backers of this development have given too little thought to its effect upon the town. Development of these province lands would be both an esthetic and an economic catastrophe.

Plans for Provincetown should be an integral part of a master plan for the lower cape as a whole and should be linked to the establishment of the national park. Their central idea should be to preserve and enhance the special character of the town. Plans thus far formulated almost totally neglect Provincetown's two chief assets: the old fishing village strung along the harbor and the cultural heritage and present cultural life of the town. Much could be done to enhance the town's special flavor and banish the honkytonk that has spoiled some sections.

But the men who want to take this land out of the public domain are thinking in narrow terms. They do not see the connection between esthetics, conservation, and economics. They will not see that people require spiritual along with physical nourishment.

One of our country's most distinguished artists, a Provincetown resident, was quoted as saying to Town Manager Lawrence at a recent citizens meeting: "There's something for the human spirit out there. All you want to do is make money. * * * Maybe this town doesn't need what you are trying to do for it. This town doesn't need to be developed."

Many of us in Provincetown believe, like him, that this wild and lovely bit of country should become a part of the national park, to be preserved for the enjoyment of future generations.

Mrs. DeWitt. My name is Miriam DeWitt. I am a voter and property owner in Provincetown. I first came here in 1911 as a child and have spent much time here since then. I was not born here, nor were my ancestors, like those of some of the witnesses who have appeared here. But if it is of any help, my ancestors settled in Massachusetts 304 years ago.

I am in favor of the park with the boundaries approximately as proposed originally in the Saltonstall-Kennedy-Keith bill. I believe the park is the only means to preserve the beauties so many witnesses have described against the pressure of the greatly expanding, rapidly expanding population. I would prefer the cape as it was a few years ago, without a park, but that is impossible. I oppose attempts to dismember the park. Such wholesale changes are undesirable from many points of view.

As Mr. Thompson so ably pointed out, the park is already small for a national park. The disconnected patchwork that would remain after the changes would be impossible to administer effectively, and would be ineffectual as conservation. These areas are not needed for expansion. Mr. Thompson gave the figures on the amount of undeveloped land in Provincetown, Truro, Wellfleet, and Eastham.

After 300 years, there is still approximately as much undeveloped land as there is developed.

With good planning—and I believe this is the key to the whole crux of the situation on the cape—this land will meet the needs in the foreseeable future. The alternative to planning is to continue to scatter houses all over wood and moors. This is bad esthetics, bad conservation, and bad economics.

Pictures in the current issue of the Cape Codder show what is happening now on large areas of unspoiled country. It will destroy the beauty and character of the area and right away drive away those who are attracted by these features.

Mr. McNeece compares the charm of the cape to a Currier and Ives print. If we continue to scatter houses in the present haphazard fashion, I fear he will some day find a cluster of split level ranch houses in the foreground of his picture.

Spreading houses all over the landscape will make a mockery of conservation, cluttering up in a short time large sections of unspoiled country. It is bad economics because not only will a widespread rash of houses and roads eventually drive away substantial property owners, but it will also raise taxes. Residential property does not as a rule carry its share of the taxload, especially if it is scattered.

Speaking of Provincetown, Mr. Snow said its young people are moving out because of a lack of land, but the population of Provincetown has been declining since 1910. Certainly there was plenty of land then. He stated that sections of province lands were needed for purely residential use. However, I doubt that Provincetown could raise taxes enough to support such an uneconomic use. This piece of wild land would be incredibly costly to develop and service. Undeveloped land closer to town would be much easier and cheaper to develop.

Incidentally, Mr. Snow said that Provincetown needs to expand its accommodations for tourists driving down the cape to Provincetown, but at the same time the development of these province lands would be purely residential. The two statements seem to conflict.

By the way, every summer I hear people wailing because there are so many vacancies.

In reply to a question by Representative Ullman, Mr. Frazier says there were so few residents of Wellfleet he knew how all of them stood on the park. Seventy-five percent of the taxpayers are nonresidents, he said, and their opinion could not count, he implied. On a matter of such moment, which affects them so vitally, shouldn't the people who mainly support the town have a voice?

Mr. Snow stated that 90 percent of the residents of Provincetown were for the taking of a part of the province lands. I believe he is in error.

As Mr. Bultman said, until last September, very few people knew anything about the proposed taking of the section of the province lands. At that time, some of the details were published locally and produced an immediate critical reaction. Many residents both native and from away oppose the taking and have said so publicly; so do many resident property owners. The selectmen do not necessarily represent the people on every issue and I am certain that on the question of boundaries they speak for a minority.

In closing, I should like to correct some of the statements made by Dr. Winslow.

I believe, and I have been assured that people with property in the park will have the vote. She said people would not be allowed to pick berries as in the province lands. That is not the case.

Also, I think the point should be cleared up. Some witnesses seem to think that homes would be taken away from people. This is not the case. They would be allowed to retain their homes.

I believe the figures given on the Truro town vote on the park were incorrect as quoted by one of the recent witnesses. I haven't the figures here, but they were put into the record at the Washington hearings.

One other point. Several people have mentioned the fact that the Atlantic Ocean provides very poor swimming. I have swum there for many years, and so have many of my friends. I have found it very gentle, except in stormy weather.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you.

Our next witness is Ross Moffett.

STATEMENT OF ROSS MOFFETT, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mr. Moffett. Madam Chairman, members of the House Subcommittee on Public Lands and Congressman Keith, my name is Ross Moffett and I have been a legal resident and voter in Provincetown for 45 years. I have been a property owner here for 35 years. While I am at it, I may say also that I was born and raised on a farm in the State of Iowa, where I still have interests. I settled in this area because of the unique charm and quiet and deliberate life of the friendly people I found here.

The setting and the kind of life I have mentioned continued here without threat of dissolution up to, I would say, the end of the Second World War. Since that time, with the influx of visitors brought in by modern travel facilities, and with the almost feverish drive to bulldoze and cover the lower cape with houses, motels, and commercial establishments of all kinds, the beautiful and traditional Cape Cod I have known so long has been disappearing with ever-increasing rapidity. In the earlier days, there seemed no necessity for a national park. In the present day, there appears no possibility of saving any desirable feature of Cape Cod except through the establishment of such a park.

I wish to express my wholehearted endorsement of the proposed park with boundaries substantially the same as those defined in the bills introduced into Congress in September 1959. I am opposed to such revisions of boundaries as were proposed by town officials at the June 21, 1960, hearings in Washington, for I think these would give us a botched and patchwork park which would be unsatisfactory to nearly everyone now and down through the future.

We in Provincetown have been much concerned lest the fine woodlands in the State-owned province lands be kept out of the park. I would say that these unspoiled woodlands should not be turned over to developers for motels, hotels, and so on, but they should be included in the park. They would constitute the park's valued northernmost feature.

There is need for the park to be speedily established, for during the past year local developers, for reasons I cannot fathom, have bulldozed and torn up several areas within the proposed park lands.

Knowing the lower cape as I do, I would like to say that the inclusion in the park of the whole width of the cape in Truro and Wellfleet is, I believe, a wise and farsighted provision of the original bills. In particular, the section of the proposed park that lies west of Route 6 is, in my opinion, the most desirable and handsome portion of the park.

There is one other matter I would like to comment on. This involves the so-called 10 percent clause by which, under certain conditions, the towns would have been allowed a 10 percent refund of this park area in private ownership. This provision was in the 1959 bills which I have endorsed, but as you know, it has been deleted. Its omission, I am inclined to think, is a mistake and I think this committee should consider restoring this provision. We would then get some moderate revision of boundaries determined over a period of time by conferences with the towns and the Government officials.

As it is, we have proposals for cutting out sizable patches here and there arbitrarily and without regard for the park as a unified and organic whole.

I hope that the House committee will report favorably on a bill for a Cape Cod National Seashore, without significant boundary modifications. Such a park, I believe, would be of great value to Cape Cod and to this Nation.

I wish to thank this congressional committee for permitting me to give my views on this proposed legislation.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Mr. Jack Tworkov.

STATEMENT OF JACK TWORKOV, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mr. Tworkov. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Jack Tworkov. I am an artist and I have been coming to Provincetown since 1923. I think you can believe me when I say that I speak for most of the people who summer in Provincetown.

Two years ago, I purchased a home here. My entire family spends its summers here and my wife and I now plan to spend at least 9 months of the year here. As a family, we consider ourselves fortunate and enriched by this contact.

I have already seen in this period many changes take place that have spoiled the original contour and charm. But the recent proposal of the town to acquire some of the province lands for commercial expansion fills me with the utmost concern. I see in it a plan to heartlessly exploit an area that is rare and beautiful and which has already been set aside by the State as park land for mere private real estate appropriation.

The province lands are a most unique stretch of wood and dune and a source of spiritual comfort for all those who seek it. It has been a magnet for poets and painters for generations and accounts for Provincetown's special and steady popularity. It also provides excellent hunting grounds for the townspeople.

The plans propose to erect five large motels, a large shopping center, a golf course and other similar enterprises—on this very land. All the effort and planning look very much like a last-minute land grab by real estate and development companies before the national park becomes a reality.

It has already been publicly stated that the town plans to give this land to a large development company. The argument, then, put forth by some that the land will be sold to individuals for private dwellings, is therefore, most unlikely.

To permit indiscriminate resort building around the park area would defeat the very purpose of the national park—this would even be true of the most exquisitely planned resort area. There is still plenty of land available for purely private building.

Provincetown already has a large number of summer dwellers. Many of these own their own houses and in the upkeep of these houses employ local labor and patronize local shops. This gives some stability to the town. A heavier tourist emphasis only aggravates a transitory and parasitic use of the town's resources—here today and gone tomorrow—with no real concern of the town's welfare and appearance. And at the end of a short summer season, a ghost town is left. This is already partially true and would only become many times more intense by the proposed plans.

If the town needs revenue, efforts should be made to establish suitable year-round employment. This would create a healthy and even flow of activity the year round and would solve a fundamental economic and moral problem for Provincetown. As it is, anyone with ambition and especially the young cannot remain here because "there is nothing to do."

I also respectfully request the committee to disregard the labeling as "crackpots" and "ne'er do wells" all those who now speak in the name of the public's interest. That leaves only those motivated by selfish concerns as the "practical" ones.

We are a rich nation, but we are already the butt of world criticism because of what seems to be our materialistic emphasis. Of what use are our riches if we cannot afford, in this instance, to maintain and preserve an area of great beauty and hallowed traditions, such as is not to be found easily anywhere else? Do we always have to yield to the demands of private business?

It is, then, for the above reasons that I am for the establishment of a national seashore park without any of the proposed deletions or retrenchments.

Thank you, Madam Chairman, I should like to make one other remark.

In this hearing, there were people speaking against establishment of the park I recognized. So many of them also spoke for the preservation of the area, which is exactly what we are speaking for. Now, the whole thing comes down to a question of this: how the park will be administered. If it is true, those dangers they foresee in the administration of the park, then I would be against the park myself. If it is true that the administration of the park would bring in millions of people, if it would bring in some necessary areas around the park, if it would increase the number of motels, and all the things that are already destroying the cape, then I would also be against the park, or at least there would be no way of choosing between two evils.

In other words, we can't really be for the park unless the administration of the park includes plans for the preservation of the area. If this is merely to open—I do not know how to put it. I have seen other seashore areas completely destroyed and turned into slums. And I would certainly not like to see this happen to the cape.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you.

Our next witness is Mrs. Werner.

STATEMENT OF MRS. M. R. WERNER, PROVINCETOWN, MASS.

Mrs. Werner. Madam Chairman and members of the Committee on Public Lands, Congressman Keith, my name is Hazel Hawthorne Werner. I am a writer by profession. I have been a summer resident of Provincetown for 42 years, a year-round, voting resident of Provincetown for the past 8 years. During the warmer seasons of the 42 years I have lived on the sand dunes in a region to be included in the proposed national seashore park. For the sake of conservation of the beloved natural features of this region I am wholly, and without reservation, in favor of the passage of bill H.R. 9050.

The incoming Secretary of the Interior, Representative Udall, in a recent report to the House, said:

> The one overriding principle of the conservation movement is that no work of man, save the bare minimum of roads, trails, and necessary public facilities in access areas should intrude into the wonder places of the National Park System.

That the outer beach and the now privately owned sand dunes between the province lands and Pilgrim Spring State Park are a wonder place is indisputable. A stranger to this area may not understand why the artists and many townspeople of Provincetown regard the province lands also as a wonder place, and why we urge its inclusion within the boundaries of the park.

It is because they are unique. Thousands of towns in our country are so alike that someone set down from the air, blindfolded, would not know his whereabouts, not one town from another. A person so set down in the back lands of Provincetown can at once exclaim, "This must be Cape Cod." He may go on, "The smell of bay leaves, these curious small oaks, this ground cover—what is it? like nothing I've ever had underfoot before. This quiet under the wind. These sandy hills. This dust-free air. This must be near the end of the Cape, this must be Provincetown."

I do not make this point for lyrical effect. I contend that such a recognition of a local terrain is good for local business. I contend that if my colleagues in protest against a proposed commercial development in the province lands stress aesthetic reasons against this development, their argument has economic weight. The appearance of our natural, unexploited landscape is vital to our economic success. To despoil our landscape is to spoil our only remaining big business, the tourist business.

The stranger set down blindfolded is also likely to say, "And here are the artists."

Let the promoter and developer beware when they disparage the term of "artist." To do so is bad for business. Once through the whole country the name of Provincetown meant fishing. Today it means painting. The artists to whom we owe this association of ideas have come here because attracted by a special, unspoiled, and very particular beauty, a 65-mile-out-in-the-Atlantic beauty. The tourist trade has trusted their choice. The least damage by commercialized development of the back lands puts in jeopardy the town's attraction to artists, and hence puts in jeopardy this profitable association of ideas in the public mind.

For this reason, I respectfully urge that the province lands be included and conserved within the boundaries of the National Seashore Park.

Thank you.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you, Mrs. Werner.

At this point, the Chair would like to thank the several members of the panel for very constructive statements.

Are there questions of the panel?

Mr. ULLMAN. I would just like to add my word of commendation and assure them their full statements will be considered.

Mrs. DE DEO. Will the official record contain the appendix to my statement?

Mrs. PFOST. Was that a newspaper clipping?

Mrs. DE DEO. Yes; it was.

Mrs. PFOST. The rules of the committee will not permit that to be made a part of the record, but it may be made a part of the file.

Mrs. DE DEO. All right.

Mrs. PFOST. Our next witness will be Henry Lyman.

STATEMENT OF HENRY LYMAN, PUBLISHER, SALT WATER SPORTSMAN, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. LYMAN. My name is Henry Lyman of Canton, Mass., and I am publisher of Salt Water Sportsman, a monthly magazine devoted to marine angling along the coasts of the United States. I have served in the past, and still do serve, on various committees and boards at the Federal, interstate, State, and local levels as an adviser on marine sport fisheries matters.

I have already submitted a statement expressing my views in favor of the seashore park and I would like to emphasize one or two points in that statement.

I am extremely familiar with the Hatteras National Seashore in North Carolina and was in on the ground floor, as it were, when that park was established. This area is very similar to Cape Cod. It has been stated earlier here that there are no national parks comparable to the ones contemplated on the cape. The area is not only similar, but the objections to establishment of the park were brought up just as they were brought up in the past 2 days here.

I would like to emphasize that control of commercial enterprises at the Hatteras National Seashore has remained in the hands of the town completely. The zoning of the towns and the town fathers of the towns concerned have complete control over all establishments, commercial or otherwise, in the area. So it is up to them as to how the area developed, it is not up to the National Park Service.

I would also like to add to my statement the fact that not only has employment increased in the area which seems to be a worry here on the cape, but also the season for summer people has increased by almost 2 months. This has meant an upsurge in the economy, prosperity in the area, and general happiness all around.

The town fathers here on Cape Cod, I suggest, should look into the situation at Hatteras, consult with the Dare County Chamber of Commerce, with the towns involved in the Hatteras area, and with the North Carolina Board of Conservation and Development. These agencies all have facts and figures which will show that the national park in that area has been a tremendous shot in the arm to the economy, without development of undesirable and nontypical businesses in that beach section.

That is all I have to say, Madam Chairman.

Thank you.

(Mr. Lyman's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HENRY LYMAN, PUBLISHER OF SALT WATER SPORTSMAN MAGAZINE, BOSTON, MASS.

My name is Henry Lyman of Canton, Mass., and I am publisher of Salt Water Sportsman, a monthly magazine devoted to marine angling along the coasts of the United States. I have served in the past, and still do serve, on various committees and boards at the Federal, interstate, State, and local levels, as an adviser on marine sport fisheries matters.

I would like to go on record as being heartily in favor of the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore. In my travels along the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts, I have noted with growing concern the vanishing shoreline. I am referring to erosion of land; I am referring to the tremendous increases in industrial developments, real estate developments, and loss of tidal areas through drainage or fill.

Although losses of coastal areas through this alleged progress has destroyed much scenic beauty, there are other factors involved which are even more important. Let me consider my own particular field of salt water sport fishing, which is the fastest growing sport in the country today. Boating also is booming, but I would like to point out that the boat and engine manufacturers themselves state that more than two-thirds of their customers list fishing as the primary reason for purchase of boats and motors.

Fewer and fewer access points to a beach are available to anglers on any U.S. seaboard today, yet the army of surf, pier, small- and large-boat fishermen is growing rapidly. In 1955, according to the survey made by the U.S. Department of the Interior, there were 4,577,000 marine anglers in this country. In 1959, according to the Sport Fishing Institute of Washington, D. C., the number had grown to 5,391,000—an increase of approximately 18 percent. From my own personal observations and figures, I believe that the increase is roughly 5 percent per year.

More leisure time, higher individual income, a better standard of living and steadily increasing population, all are factors which cause this angling pressure to increase at an even greater rate as the years go by. The beaches of the outer Cape Cod areas are among the finest in the world for the surf angler. Their value to the people of the United States from this aspect alone is great today and will be far greater in the next decade. If the present rate of development of real estate and commercial enterprises on Cape Cod continues, the entire area will be lost to the general public forever just as the beaches of New Jersey and other areas have been lost. The Cape Cod National Seashore would prevent this.

Objections have been raised that the proposed national seashore would do several things: first, it would reduce land values; second, it would decrease the tax base in the towns involved; third, it would handicap commercial enterprises in the vicinity of the area; finally, it would handicap exploitation of Cape Cod's major industry—the tourist trade. All these objections are without foundation in the long-term picture, as can be seen from the record.

Hatteras National Seashore in North Carolina has been in operation for many years. When the Hatteras National Seashore was first contemplated, the same objections were advanced. Today land values have increased astronomically. One parcel of land with which I am familiar in the Hatteras area sold recently for 500 times the value placed upon it when the Park Service first started operations. This is an extreme case, but the increase in land value has been phenomenal.

With the increase in land value, obviously the tax base for the towns concerned has been increased also. This did not happen overnight, but it did happen over the years, so that the towns, in the long run, gained revenue. Land alone is only one part of the picture. Commercial enterprises connected with the Hatteras National Seashore have sprung up to provide services to visitors and, of course, all of these commercial enterprises are taxable. They have the additional advantages of requiring no school appropriation in the towns in which they are situated—an appropriation which is a major factor in any town budget. Commercial enterprises connected with my own particular field—fishing piers, tackle shops, small-boat liveries, charter boats, motels, restaurants, and the like—have increased tenfold since the advent of the park and have operated successfully in areas suitable for their operation and zoned for it.

As far as tourist trade is concerned, this business doubled each year for 5 years after the Hatteras National Seashore was established. Now business is leveling off, but each year has shown a respectable increase according to figures of the Dare County Chamber of Commerce. Most important as far as tourist business is concerned, the increase has been mainly from those who travel in family groups. They are not weekend trippers, who may care little for their surroundings or the communities in which they stay. They are substantial citizens who return again and again for long visits—in many cases for the entire holiday season. Many have purchased homes in the area and take a sincere interest in community affairs.

To say that all has been sweetness and light at Hatteras since the park was established there would be to stretch the truth. There have been squabbles between the Park Service and local residents from time to time. All of these have been settled eventually, but to my mind more rapid settlement would have prevented much bad feeling. I therefore urge that, when the Cape Cod National Seashore becomes a reality, the National Park Service place on the cape itself an official with sufficient authority to settle minor policy disputes immediately. This would eliminate time lost in the redtape of Washington, which causes unnecessary hardship on the individual landowner.

Others better qualified than I will emphasize that establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore will save breeding and nursery grounds for marine and anadromous fish, nesting and feeding grounds for waterfowl and other forms of bird life, and a unique section of this country for flora and fauna of many types. My business is salt water sport fishing. Selfishly perhaps, I would like to see your children and your children's children enjoy angling from the Cape Cod beaches as I have done ever since I was old enough to toddle over the dunes. Establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore will make this possible.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you, Mr. Lyman.

Are there questions of Mr. Lyman?

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Lyman, in summary, you are saying that the park would not reduce land values as suggested, that it would not necessarily decrease the tax base because of the development, thirdly, that it would not handicap commercial enterprise in the vicinity of the area, and finally, it would not handicap the tourist industry. These are the points you are bringing out?

Mr. LYMAN. Yes, sir, that is absolutely true, and the facts of the agencies I mentioned in North Carolina can support my statments.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you.

Are there further questions? Thank you very much, Mr. Lyman.

Our next group of witnesses is Mr. Orin Tovrov, Werner Lieb, Harry Taylor, Nester A. Aalpe.

You may proceed, Mr. Tovrov.

STATEMENT OF ORIN TOVROV, ORLEANS, MASS.

Mr. TOVROV. Thank you, Madam Chairman. Madam Chairman and Members of the Congress, my name is Orin Tovrov. I am a resident of Orleans; I am a member of the Orleans School Committee, and the Nauset Regional School Committee. I have filed a brief and you know my position.

The national seashore park has won the battle for me by abdication. I am for the park because no serious counterproposal has been offered to save this little American wilderness as a wilderness for the generations of the future.

Now, I should like to elaborate on my filed statement as it applies to the schools of this area. You must give to Eastham and Wellfleet some recompense in Federal funds if you are going to take away half of their tax base. Eastham and Wellfleet have two school contracts with Orleans, legitimate ties by the legislature. The three towns form a superintendency known as school union No. 55 and also form a school region known as Nauset region, which runs a three-town high school. Each of the towns has a grammar school.

These three grammar schools share the cost of a superintendent, an elementary school supervisor, a vocal music supervisor, an orchestral music supervisor and physical education supervisor. Our new high school which is in its second year of operation cost us $1,600,000, amortized over 20 years. The annual total capital cost to the three towns is $80,000. The annual operating cost of the high school is over $300,000, the annual operating cost of the Wellfleet Elementary School for 1961 will be about $52,000 and Eastham about $60,000; Orleans bears one-half the cost of the region and one-half the cost of the seven employees of the union.

The other two towns supply the other 50 percent. I would like to point out to the Congress that an impossible burden in school taxes would be placed on the Eastham and Wellfleet taxpayers if there is no compensation, as the present Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Seaton, suggested for the loss of taxable property. The only alternative open to the school committee would be to cut back on the educational service of the union and the region. To this Orleans would certainly not agree, nor probably the parents of Eastham and Wellfleet.

In any event, Eastham and Wellfleet are bound to pay their share of the capital costs of the new high school. Therefore, any taking of Eastham or Wellfleet land without a scheme of compensation would have drastic effect upon our own educational system in Orleans, as well as in the towns within the park area.

Thank you.

(Mr. Tovrov's statement follows:)

REMARKS OF ORIN TOVROV, ORLEANS, MASS.

I am a Cape Codder by choice. By birth my wife and I are Chicagoans. We began summering on Cape Cod in 1939. We became permanent residents in 1946, when we purchased our present home in Orleans.

By profession I am an author. I write radio and television serials. I am the author of "Ma Perkins," "The Brighter Day," and "The Secret Storm."

For an author, or at any rate for me, two things are most important in the environment of his residence. One is tranquillity. The second is emotion. Good writing is emotion recalled in tranquillity.

I settled here on the lower cape because here I found both the tranquillity and the emotion.

Perhaps it is vain of me to point out that my work has been broadcast daily to many millions of our fellow Americans in all 50 of the States. Perhaps it is neither relevant nor proper to point out that our fellow citizens seem to have enjoyed what I chose to write about. What I have chosen to write about, for many years, is Cape Cod, although in my work itself I never labeled it as such.

There is something very deep in the character of all Americans which responds to any reminiscence of the American past, the conquest of a virgin wilderness, the evoking of our sense that we are a pioneer people. This is the emotion of which I spoke. It is an emotion produced in me, and through my work produced in all who attend my work, by the sea and skies and moors and marshes of Cape Cod.

It is the artists, most of them better artists than I am, who preserve for a nation its sense of its own past. If we are to permit the despoiling of this last little eastern wilderness, something will be taken away from the custodians of our history, the writers and poets and painters, and therefore taken away from the generations yet to come. Cape Cod might continue to live in legend, like the seven hills of Rome when Aeneas landed there, but I don't think that legend serves quite the same function as reality.

In general terms, I see no particular merit to the operations of the Federal Government, either in its workings with other governments or in its workings in local affairs. In itself there is nothing particularly good about a national seashore park here on Cape Cod. It just so happens to be the only serious and practical proposal put forward for the preservation of the natural beauties of the area, and its protection from shortsighted commercial interests. In all the months since the national seashore was first proposed, not one single serious counterproposal has been suggested. Thus the proposal for a Federal park has won the day in my mind by abdication if nothing else. The opponents of the park have yet to agree on a program to save the area, and thus they have abdicated any serious man's serious consideration of their random counterproposals.

One more point and I shall be done. I am a member of the Orleans School Committee and a member of the Nauset Regional School Committee. Orleans itself would be much less affected by the proposed Federal park than would two other towns of the region, Eastham and Wellfleet. Speaking only for myself, and not for my town or the other towns or the two committees on which I sit, only for myself, I can't see how Eastham and Wellfleet could bear the burden of the school tax if they give their lands to the Federal park without tax compensation. I consider the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, that Eastham and Wellfleet not be compensated for the loss of taxable property, outrageous and cruel. Unless Federal funds are made available to Eastham and Wellfleet to compensate them for the loss of taxable property, a wholly impossible burden of taxation will be imposed on the taxpayers of those towns, and the maintenance of our justly celebrated school system will be greatly jeopardized.

Thank you.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you.

Our next witness will be Mr. Werner Lieb.

STATEMENT OF WERNER LIEB, TRURO, MASS.

Mr. LIEB. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, I am very glad to be here with you and give you my views on the park. I have testified here last year at the congressional hearings and I could almost repeat what I have said at that time. I will just tell you about myself.

I have been a yearly visitor to Cape Cod for 30 years, acquired 14 acres of land in the upper Pamet Valley 20 years ago, and have been a permanent resident since 1956. A professional horticulturist for over 60 years, I founded the first nurseries in Morocco, North Africa, later serving as consultant on reforestation for the Government of Uruguay, South America. For the past 40 years I have been engaged in horticultural pursuits in the State of New York.

The résumé of my background is made to explain that I am in full accord with every principle to preserve natural beauty. My wife, our children and I, love Cape Cod and our hard-earned homestead. I absolutely concur in the effort to retain the beauty of its magnificent beaches and dunes for future generations.

This could be achieved, in full accord with the often-stated wishes of the inhabitants, by the acquisition of beaches and adjoining undeveloped land. In conjunction with strict zoning laws and building codes as adopted by all affected communities during the past two years, everything for the conservation of natural resources could be attained at a relatively small cost.

However, we are here to deal with a concrete proposition, bill H.R. 9050, identical with S. 2636, providing for the establishment of a Cape Cod National Seashore.

At this point, Madam Chairman, am I right if I say we are talking about something that is dead? Isn't this bill already dead?

Mr. PFOST. This particular bill to which you have referred?

Mr. LIEB. I mean our hearing reference to that bill.

Mrs. PFOST. Our hearing is very much alive, and will be printed and will be taken into consideration at the next session of the Congress. There will be new bills with new numbers that will be introduced, no doubt, in the coming session.

Mr. LIEB. So I am right in saying we are really talking about something which is dead.

Mrs. PFOST. So far as the numbers of these bills only.

Mr. LIEB. In dimensions and objectives, this bill follows the original proposal contained in the National Park Service field report and brochure, as do the three preceding bills.

It is an extremely ambitious bill and claims, for its many facets of geology, history, flora and fauna, a far too large share of our narrow land. In Truro this amounts to 75 percent of the entire town. The bill stresses recreational facilities of various kinds. These may well defeat the park's own purpose—preservation.

In its own survey the Park Service foresees that very soon millions of visitors will congregate here during the summer months. Without a large supervisory staff this creates a mortal danger to conservation. Let me give you just one example. Our slowly regenerating woodlands, in the past periodically destroyed by fires of gigantic dimensions, are immensely vulnerable. We have a very low precipitation during the summer, steady winds accentuate a dangerous drought problem. Camping, picnicking and hiking, will present a dangerous problem which does not exist today. Our present summer visitors do not frequent woodlands, but confine themselves to beaches.

Transportation facilities on this very narrow strip of land are even now inadequate during the summer months. Park traffic will reach terrifying dimensions inasmuch as a three-lane highway is the only means of entrance and egress for 30 miles, from Orleans to Provincetown.

The introduction to the explanatory companion bill to H.R. 9050 states:

> The authors of this bill know from long personal experience as well as many years of official responsibility that lower Cape Cod cannot be considered solely as a geographical area with certain physical characteristics. The lower Cape must also be viewed as a way of life—a culture—which though conditioned by its environment, finds its essence in the people who have lived and are living here. This bill seeks to preserve the way of life which these people have established and maintained on the Cape.

I speak about something which is the core, the heart of the Kennedy-Saltonstall bill—the valuation of our homesteads and communities. I say here we owe a debt of deep gratitude to the authors of the Kennedy-Saltonstall-Keith bill for their admirable service for the salvation of homesteads and communities, saving many millions of dollars for the Government.

But at the same time, we see it as our duty to express our earnest conviction that if adopted, without alterations, it will surely impair the way of life for all of us. In fact, the climate of insecurity prevailing on Cape Cod for the last 3 years, is doing so now.

Now, allow me to give you a little idea of what I mean. The national park is throwing a shadow ahead. There have been numerous incidents in the last few years of people coming into homesteads, into front yards, into woods which belong to private houses, camping, tenting, picnicking and if they are approached and asked if they know they are on private property, we hear the answer, "No, this is national park, don't you know this is national park?" The word national park seems to alter the mentality of people and morality, too.

It has been my experience on the seashore and our beaches we are not allowed to take dogs to the shore. I approached a lady who had a dog and I asked her, "Did you see the announcement at the beginning of the beach that dogs could not enter here?" She said, "How dare you talk to me? This is national park." She can do almost what she likes.

Now, the Cape Codders, the native people, we are very, very attached to them. I will say, first, I am, of course, somebody who is a latecomer, but we latecomers, we came here of choice. We have saved and worked and planned for many, many years before coming to the cape some day to retire here. It is not easy to retire on the cape because it is a luxury to live on Cape Cod. But we like the cape, we like its inhabitants and we are very proud if they give us their esteem. These people are born here and in comparison to them they are the relatives and we are the lovers. We love this land and we are so attached to it, we are sometimes more attached to it than people who have been living here all their lives.

I personally would like to stress the human aspect of this whole proposition. We were confronted about a year and a half ago with the so-called Neuberger bill wherein the taking of the park, the dimensions were left to the Secretary of the Interior. And Judge Francis Biddle alerted us and told us we should, by all means, do something about this. I have corresponded with Mr. Saltonstall, with Senator Kennedy, about this matter. I have letters here. They are not for this proposition at all and they express themselves so. The two gentlemen and Congressman Keith went together and made a very wonderful bill which had as its heart the provision which is here the authority of eminent domain shall be suspended with respect to all improved property in any of such towns during all times when such towns shall have in force applicable to such property a duly adopted zoning law proposed by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions proposed by section 6 of this act.

The proponents of this bill say this section of the bill together with sections 5 and 6 may be considered as the heart of this bill. The provision that we property holders, I would say houseowners, could keep our property and be exempt from the danger of being expropriated gives the only guarantee which can make this bill digestible for us. I hope that the provision is in the bill. It allows the towns to keep all of the property on the tax roll. They would not lose these taxes and the United States would not find it necessary to acquire this property.

Mrs. Pfost. Mr. Lieb, you are exceeding the time limit you requested. How much longer is it going to require?

Mr. Lieb. Just a moment.

Mrs. Pfost. May I offer a solution? Could you gather together your substatements and present them to the committee for incorporation in the record?

Mr. Lieb. There is just one more word I wanted to call your attention to the statement of Mr. Thompson, who spoke for Dr. Conrad Wirth yesterday on the proposal of the park bill. In this statement there was nothing mentioned of the heart provision of the bill which we are talking about now. And this I hope when the new bill will be brought out, this bill will have a heart again.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Mr. Taylor. Mr. Taylor, you appear to have a very lengthy statement. Are you prepared to brief it in a few moments?

Mr. Taylor. I do not think I could do it in a few moments. I have a prepared statement in specifics that would probably have taken an hour. I will try to condense it to about 10 minutes.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF HARRY TAYLOR, NORTH EASTHAM, MASS.

Mr. Taylor. Madam Chairman and members of the House Interior Committee, our Congressman Keith, ladies and gentlemen, as I said, I am going to condense this which will not lend to its continuity and I hope you will overlook this. I do this with the urgent recommendation that you read the paper because it deals in specifics, not generalities. I have even suggested changes in the language of the bill, as written, that would correct many things.

I have been connected with Eastham for 55 years and for experience I have had 30 years with Commissioner Robert Moses of New York City and New York State, who is probably recognized as the highest authority on parks in the world. That doesn't make me a Robert Moses, but it has been a valuable experience.

Now, my position is that I am in favor of the park despite the fact that I will spend the rest of my time in trying to bring about changes and insertions in the law which would make this park palatable to the people who are going to have to live with it down here.

Perhaps the two most important points are: (1) the amount of land to be taken; and (2) in-lieu-of-taxes.

I have a specific recommendation as far as the town of Eastham is concerned. I am going to pass over that entirely because it takes care of it in the wording.

Now, I have besides that several other sections of law dealt with specifically, which I will pass over, except to point out to you one thing that is very important to the people here. There are, of course, owners of 32,000 acres proposed to be taken in this park, a large part of which is vacant land. You will find in the bill, or in the comments about the bill, words which suggest that this taking may extend over 25 years. Now, you can see the hardship that would be put on the people who own particularly vacant land, where they would have no income, could not use it and would have to pay taxes on it unless there is some relief for this.

There is a suggestion here which, in brief, is that they may notify the Secretary that they intend to build, giving him a period of perhaps 4 to 6 months in which to acquire the property, if he wants to.

I go directly to one of the two very important points; that is the payment in-lieu-of-taxes. Section 8(a) provides for between 2 and 3 years of payment in-lieu-of-taxes lost by the town for land taken in fee simple. This is grossly inadequate and in sharp contrast to the 20-year provision of other bills.

Now, yesterday, Mr. Thompson gave figures of 80 cents for Eastham, $2.70 for Truro, and $1.97 as the amount which these towns would be penalized. However, he skipped the first column of the schedule which he was reading. Let us see what the economic study by Economic Development Associates had to say.

This was a study paid for by the National Park Service supposedly to allay our fears, I presume. When all the property to the park is taken, a condition we must agree is the purpose of the act, the tax rates in three towns would be greatly increased over present rates; in Eastham $7.92, or 20 percent; Truro, $20.24 or 59 percent; Wellfleet, $13.17 or 35 percent. This could be cushioned by slow taking which is bad for the property owners of the vacant land, particularly, but though hidden in revised figures, it has to be the true end result. But this is not still the whole picture. No economic survey has used anything but present construction in the park area, but they do project the area outside as built up in 15 years, at which time the construction industry, our only real stable industry, presumably would collapse.

Let's look a little deeper. It has been shown in the "Eastham Planning Report" by Blair Associates that there are 2,420 acres of usable vacant land within the park taking of 3,650 acres in Eastham. Allow

1 acre per lot, including roads, and we could have as many as 2,420 new houses, say, averaging $20,000 in value or $48 million. Use one-third for assessed value equals $16 million where our total present assessment is around $6 million. And our construction industry, under those circumstances, would be stable indefinitely.

We might want many larger plots and better houses and some lesser, but it would average out roughly the same. We would also incur added town problems, but we would be able to pay for them. We would, however, also destroy the present charm of the cape and keep millions from enjoying one of the last remaining unspoiled beaches on the Atlantic Coast.

I feel strongly that this overrides any other consideration against a reasonably selected national park. But we are at this point talking about in-lieu-of-taxes and this shows the sacrifice you are asking these towns to make. Should we go further and ask a comparatively few thousand people to subsidize the advantage they will be sacrificing to millions by saddling them with an inadequate in-lieu-of-taxes?

The survey showed that of these townspeople two-thirds have incomes of $3,000 or under, and 86 percent, $4,000 or under. I might digress at this point to say that there are a lot of people in public housing with these salaries in the City of New York which, of course, is more expensive living. I submit the millions who will enjoy the park would better afford the infinitesimal cost to each of them to pay this part of the park cost.

I suggest a full 5 years of full in-lieu-taxes, plus 20 years of straight reductions as a base.

I have written a considerable amount about the value of conservation in this area. I will skip them at the moment, except to bring out this point. In this, I have asked under section 9 that the mandate to active recreation be strengthened and this is not because I am against conservation, but I think it has been so emphasized in section 9 that the importance of the two other items seem to be obscured (a) the active recreation and (b) restoration and development. I will spare you the detail given in my Senate paper proving from the Park Service field report of 1958 that from the standpoint of unique flora the park had better be on Fire Island, N.Y., or in the New Jersey Pine Barrens. The fauna is the same or less than most of the eastern United States and from this standpoint could be better placed in innumerable areas.

As for the beaches, our trouble comes from the erosion of the Atlantic Ocean which takes 3 to 5 feet a year from our dunes and this, of course, will eradicate any minor erosion that use by people would put on it.

I am now going to touch on one other thing that is also very important. The Advisory Commission created under section 10 is very important; it is the last voice of the people. It is too important to risk becoming a handpicked group by this or any other future Secretary. The six members from the town should be elected or appointed by the selectmen directly, and the Governor should appoint his, too. At present, they can only make recommendations for the Secretary to make appointments. The Chairman should be selected by themselves. They should be able to call for consultations as well as the Secretary. They should advise on administration and development on all sections of the bill, not just sections 4, 5, and 6.

There should be an added section against competing with local accommodations and services. Preference should be granted locally on concessions where feasible and possible.

At this point, I will make what little comment I am going to make about camping. Mr. Foster yesterday brought out the strong economic position of the major number of campers in our Brewster State Camp. This is competition with the local people because most of the campers in there could have afforded to hire cottages, many of which were vacant for parts of the summer throughout this entire area. The only part of camping that I think may be justified is for those who because of their financial position would be losing a vacation in this particular area. Now, this could be handled by two points in your law under which you could stand up. One is zoning. In here the Secretary has been in a position to largely influence the zoning we can have in these towns which is very good. Camping is perhaps the lowest form of zoning that you could have. It is inconsistent. Because of this, you could give the town a right to comment at least if not support zoning which applied to camping. It also could be handled in the section under which you would state that it must be kept to a position where they would not compete with local facilities such as cottages.

That is as far as I will go into that.

Here are some new things which were not in the Senate report. I will touch on them because they came out in this economic study.

It brought out several important predictions. I wish to say I think this report was conscientiously and impartially made. It predicts a bright economic future for the cape, increased materially by the creation of the park. This has been so wherever bigger crowds have been attracted and will undoubtedly occur here, too, despite any unattractive features that go with having crowds we may not sufficiently appreciate. It is what makes Broadway in New York and other downtown business avenues worth thousands of dollars a front foot——

Mrs. Pfost. Mr. Taylor, I am sorry to interrupt. You have used 14 minutes. I wondered how much longer it might require for you to summarize.

Mr. Taylor. Perhaps 5 minutes. I will skip most of this part that is written, but I have some comments which are of a professional nature which I think must be made.

Mrs. Pfost. Are they not embodied in your full statement?

Mr. Taylor. No; they are not.

Mrs. Pfost. We are going to ask consent that supplemental statements be received for the record and be incorporated immediately following your statement. I wonder if you might be able to do that for us in the interest of time.

Mr. Taylor. I would like to go through that part and let the rest of this part go. I will keep that within about 2 minutes. I think this would be also of interest to our selectmen and to several of the other people because it bears directly on this.

Mrs. Pfost. If you could summarize in 2 minutes, we would appreciate it very much.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will summarize quickly.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will refer to my experience record on the back of this report because the statements I am going to make now I think require a professional backing and also experience in park work.

Mr. Thompson yesterday said that the minimum size of this park should be the 32,000 acres outlined. He said this is the most serious trouble with this present act. This has been, of course, brought out by the selectmen who have recommended changes to you.

Let me review some of the reasons. I am sorry you did not ask him why it was necessarily the minimum, or why it would be impaired.

The minimum size of this park despite the fact he says it is small is 50 square miles. That is a lot of ground. That is 1,393,920,000 square feet. They said 10 million visitor-days would be here which if divided quickly by about 90 days would show having an average of about 111,000 visitors per day. This would provide some 13,860 square feet per person, which obviously will not be used.

I bring these out to give you a picture of how much land there is here for the number of people it is going to really take. As a contrast to this, in New York City on housing, they have some 440 persons living on an acre in some of the newer housing developments that have been two-thirds paid for by the Federal Government under the renewal provisions.

Here is something that goes directly to what they need. Jones Beach is comparable as an active recreation beach. It is the type that should be put here, perhaps not as elaborate, but it takes care of a quarter of a million people a day. This is twice as much as you would have in a day in this park, and the active area is about a mile. I know this because I helped build it.

I was going to go back and show you in the Senate report how little there is here that actually needs conservation from the unique, etc., but you can read that.

Most of the activity was shown in this brochure which is the park's own preliminary—and I know they will change it but it is the preliminary picture of what they would put in, it is along the coast and it will be that way when they get through revising it. Most of island stuff is bird watching or observation. They will, of course, also put trails and that sort of thing in, but there is 40 miles in length of this, 50 square miles and they cannot possibly use all of that.

There was the statement of the use of the land by Mr. Thompson yesterday, in which he emphasized that we have as much land left as was used in the last 300 years. Let's go back to some of the reasons.

The population density as early as 1800, we had up to that time run up to 5 million, or a little over. We are now progressing at the rate of some 20 million or 25 million persons every census taken and they are up to about 180 million. Most of this came since 1900.

The other things that affect it are the lifespan of people which has not increased 15 years, and somewhere in the last 30, which is now one of the main reasons for our being developed as a retirement area, which is coming more and more. Another thing is the shortened workweek, and we probably will have even shorter workweeks in the future.

I was going to touch on Morris Island which I have gone over. I find there is nothing in there except these cedars and going over Morris Island, I have considerable trouble in finding the cedars. There are about 7 acres. They would go into a town park if the selectmen request them, which would provide that. In order to reach these 7 acres, if you will look at the map, you will find that they are separated by rivers from Morris Island, except the present approach through Chatham and you have looked at that perhaps yesterday, and you know those streets can't take that kind of traffic. It would ruin Chatham to put that in.

In Provincetown—Mr. Snow gave me a map this morning—there are perhaps a hundred acres of usable land for development there now. You can go back to the detail in his statement. There is not 400 acres as made by a previous "parker." In there, there is a water station and the city dump.

I had in one part of my statement which I skipped a comment on——

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Taylor, would you be able to give us that in a supplemental statement, please?

Mr. TAYLOR. This is the last thing. I am just going to submit to you a map which shows on it a suggested route for express traffic leading from the circle in Orleans to Gull Pond, and then a parkway.

I recommend to you serious consideration of the Bates report. I am sorry I took so much time, but I have condensed it as much as I could.

Thank you.

(Mr. Taylor's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF HARRY TAYLOR, NORTH EASTHAM, MASS.

Honorable sirs, as to my qualifications to comment on the above-mentioned park plan and proposed legislation, I am a licensed professional engineer and land surveyor (New York No. 17295), have had close associations with Eastham for 55 years, and have had 30 years of pertinent experience at the executive level under Commissioner Robert Moses of New York before retiring here. My family has owned land in Eastham for about 50 years.

While the above experience by no means makes me a second Robert Moses, it has been unusual and invaluable. A summary of my education and experience is attached. It includes experience with seashore parks such as Jones Beach, Gilgo Beach, a plan for Fire Island, all on Long Island, N.Y. They are near more heavily settled areas, noted by Senator Kennedy in his remarks to Congress as contrasted with the usual national park areas in "unsettled wildernesses or forest areas."

Let me clarify my position. I feel that the great outer beach should be preserved with substantial areas back of it where the unique or scenic values so justify its preservation. A park at some governmental level is the best vehicle. A national park could do it better because of available funds beyond the town or State level if it was designed in the best interests of residents and taxpayers of the affected towns as well as the establishment of a thoroughly adequate park. I think your bill is basically good and a great improvement over former bills. I think it would be better if some further protections were written in to insure that the obvious good intent should be clear and a mandate to the National Park Service.

Since the Senate hearing in Eastham there have been many suggestions and arguments advanced. Some seem to be taking root. Our Congressman Hastings Keith has taken a definite stand on some of the more important amendments needed. The Senate committee was supposedly giving serious consideration to some amendments. However, a later bill supposedly sponsored by the National Park Service not only gave no relief but cut out payments in lieu of taxes. Our Massachusetts Senators rejected this and pressed for passage of their own, and Representative Keith's, bill without any of the changes suggested. Therefore you still have the same bill before you as far as is publicly known. Therefore, much of the above and what follows is also identical to the recommendation given at the Senate hearing, particularly the specific changes section by section. I will condense this in the oral presentation.

Perhaps the most important change needed is in the area of land to be taken. After sufficient land is taken for the specific purposes of the park (which in this case is a seashore one) nothing important is accomplished by taking excess land just because it is also similar to or interesting for the same reasons as the necessary adequate major taking. When these excess takings seriously affect the welfare of four of the six towns involved, it becomes imperative that these excesses be eliminated or cut with the towns' interests having preference. Chatham, Eastham, Wellfleet, and Truro are all seriously hurt. Provincetown's problem will probably be solved by grants from State's province lands before the remainder is given to the national park.

I will not go into changes except in Eastham as Representative Keith has personally received recommendations from the various towns' boards of selectmen, and other officials. I would be satisfied with either the Eastham selectmen's recommendations or my own preference which follows:

1. In Eastham from the Wellfleet line to Nauset Road there is a broad area mostly flat of scrub oak and pine—excellent for development but of questionable park value after a substantial area nearest the shore were taken. I suggest the taking line be changed to run ¾ of a mile back from present shore between the Wellfleet line and Cable Road; thence along Cable Road to and along Nauset Road till it intersects Salt Pond Road near Salt Pond; thence along Salt Pond to and along Route 6 to land of the town of Eastham at the town hall. Thence around the town land to its south boundary extended easterly to the taking along Salt Pond Bay as outlined. It is my feeling that the taking along the Nauset Marsh to the Orleans line should more closely follow the shoreline as the present line does more damage than the benefit to the park would warrant.

The line suggested would permit more trails, etc., than the park could use and would permit a residential buffer (practically a must), between the park and the railroad and commercial zone. It would also eliminate a pocket of some 40 existing homes between Nauset Road and Salt Pond Road, an area of little use to the park with so many people already living there, as well as being expensive. It would add a gore of vacant land zoned for business between the present line and the town hall along Route 6—a bad oversight from a park standpoint. Part of the land around the town hall could be swapped to the town for a badly needed extension of its civic center.

2. Section 2(e): The words "and may be" should be eliminated after Secretary and the words "from local appraisers" added to the end of the paragraph. There is no reason the Secretary should not have the competent advice required in a condemnation court or the owners protected from an ill-advised appraisal from someone inexperienced in this area.

3. Section 4(c): This section poses no restriction on the Secretary as he need only withhold his use permit in order to condemn commercial or industrial property. It also imposes an unreasonable provision on the owner who must apply for permission to continue before he knows whether his property will be included in the park or whether the park will be "established" by the Secretary. It would make more sense to suspend the Secretary's right to condemn for a period of 6 months after he gives written notice of his intention to do so.

4. Section 4(d): After the first sentence add "The term 'improved property' shall also include such properties improved after September 1, 1959, but before the enactment of this act as the Secretary may in his discretion approve upon written application of the owner." The term "improved property" shall also apply to properties improved after the enactment of this act provided the requirements of section 4(b)(2) are met and the owner serves notice in writing to the Secretary of his intentions to so improve the property.

In conjunction with this change, section 6(a) should be rewritten to include the regulations specifying standards or at the very least change the words "as soon as practical" to "within 3 months," plus a requirement that he disclose his requirements by February 1, 1960. The townspeople have a right to know in time to comment. The sponsors of this bill may also be interested as the protections set up by sections 4 and 5 could easily be nullified by unreasonable or capricious requirements.

The above changes would accomplish the following:

(*a*) Give the Secretary discretionary power to make agreements with owners who built after September 1, 1959, under section 4(a), probably to the benefit of both the Government and owner. This power now seems to be lacking.

(*b*) Protect owners after enactment of the act from holding stagnated land, unsalable but with taxes, for the 25 years or more referred to in section 8(d). The Government will be protected, however, because the Secretary will have notice in time to take a future option, make an agreement under section 4(a), or purchase or condemn the vacant land.

(*c*) It would remove a substantial part of the operation to the park.

5. Section 8(a) provides for between 2 and 3 years of payments in lieu of taxes lost by the towns for land taken in fee simple. This is grossly inadequate and in sharp contrast to the 20-year provisions of other bills. I have reviewed a large amount of data bearing on the impact of the park, particularly on the all-year residents. Since you have received two economic surveys and one more may come, I have not tried to fully develop the data, but it is obvious the impact will be hard on a group not too well constituted to absorb it. Consider that there are a large percentage of retired people, a large percentage work out of town, and the pay scale is comparatively low. A new regional high school has caused a heavy tax rise without the park impact. Fixed retired income is not resilient to added costs. Out-of-town workers will absorb increased service jobs created by the park in town but will not increase the earnings they now bring in. Low wage scale is no help. On top of this the building industry, which has the biggest group of in-town workers, needs time for long-haul construction to broaden the tax base to ease the impact.

Let us see what the economic study by Economic Developments Associates, Inc., had to say. This was the study paid for by the National Park Service supposedly to allay our fears, I presume. When all the property for the park is taken (a condition we must agree is the purpose of the act), the tax rates in three towns would be greatly increased over present rates; in Eastham, $7.92 or 20 percent, Truro $20.24 or 59 percent, Wellfleet $13.17 or 35 percent. This could be cushioned by slow taking which is bad for property owners, particularly of vacant land, but hidden in revised figures it has to be the true end result. But this is not still the whole picture. No economic survey has used anything but present construction in the park area but they do project the area outside as built up in 15 years at which time the construction industry, our only real stable industry, presumably would collapse.

Let us look a little deeper. It has been shown (in the Eastham planning report by Blair Associates) that there are 2,420 acres of usable vacant land within the park taking of 3,650 acres in Eastham. Allow one acre per lot including roads, and we could have as many as 2,420 new houses, say averaging $20,000 in value equals $48,400,000. Use say one-third for assessed value equals $16 million. Our present assessment is around $6 million, and our construction industry would be stable indefinitely. Now we might want large plots and better houses and some lesser, but it would average out roughly the same. We would also incur added town problems but we would be able to pay for them. We would also destroy the present charm of the cape and cheat millions from enjoying one of the last remaining unspoiled beaches on the Atlantic coast. I feel strongly this overrides any other considerations against a reasonably selected national park. But we are at this point talking about "in lieu of taxes" and this shows the sacrifice you are asking these towns to make. Should we go further and ask a comparatively few thousand people to subsidize the advantage they will be sacrificing to millions by saddling them with an adequate "in lieu of taxes"? The surveys have shown that of these townspeople two-thirds have incomes of $3,000 or under and 86 percent $4,000 or under. I submit the millions who will enjoy the park would better afford the infinitesimal cost to each of them to pay this part of the park cost. I suggest 5 years of full in lieu of taxes plus 20 years of straight reduction as a base.

6. Section 8(b): This section apparently leaves the residents tax free in improved properties which are bargained for by the Secretary under section 4(a), as it appears State law would not allow the town to collect under even a conditional Federal title. The simple way to resolve it would be for the Secretary to pay in lieu of taxes and reflect it in the bargain with the owner. It is important to the town as improved properties carry the higher assessments. Rather than to overhaul the State law it would be simpler to remove the word "No" from the first line and the word "ever" from the fourth line.

7. In my paper to the Senate committee I said that section 9 poises a dagger right at the heart of the Cape Cod economy. Whether a large percentage of the people can afford to stay in these affected towns depends largely on the amount of generated additional business and development on remaining privately owned land. Both of these depend directly on the recreational opportunities. Unless these recreational opportunities are kept in full supply as at present the business and development will decrease rather than increase. To understand this you must realize that this area now receives over 90 percent of its revenue from the summer trade and the building generated by it. The former widespread commercial farming, clamming, and fishing is gone. Let's make this one park where the mandate is "to preserve the way of life which these people have established and maintained on the cape." to quote a section of the preamble, and let's give those who will remain living in the park the protection they want against objectionable activities close to their homes. We can have the active recreation we need, particularly swimming, boating, hunting, and fishing without crowding those who live in the park. Let's also set such minimum of tent colonies as we must have in separate areas with their own beach areas so they will not crowd our tenants and summer homeowners. The park is 40 miles long. The National Park Service will still have over 90 percent to conserve to its heart's content. They are a dedicated group with plenty of experience in conservation because this has been their major business. They will do a good job of this without a mandate. Let's, therefore, also put the mandate on the active recreation mentioned above and protection of park residents.

I am not against conservation, but I think it is so emphasized under section 9 that the importance of two other items is being obscured; (*a*) the active recreation and (*b*) restoration and development. I will spare you the detail given in my Senate hearing paper, proving from the Park Service field report of 1958 that from the standpoint of "unique flora" the park had better be on Fire Island, N.Y., or in the New Jersey pine barrens. The fauna is the same or less than most of the Eastern United States and from this standpoint could be better placed in innumerable areas.

As to the physiographic conditions now existing, none of the recreations endanger these unless serious fires result from camping. We will concede that they restrict or eliminate camping which certainly was not recommended by the Cape Codders. These fires are a real hazard. The real changes will come from the winds and storms along the ocean front where we still lose 3 to 5 feet a year. Any manmade damage is so insignificant it is negligible. Hence, to pin down the intent of this bill and remove unnecessary temptation to overzealous preservation, I suggest the following changes:

In paragraph (b)(1) put a period after the word "wilderness" and eliminate the rest of the paragraph.

In section 9(c) eliminate the last sentence which also overrides the hunting mandate of paragraph (b)(1). We do not ask to eliminate existing bird refuges or even preclude new ones. We do wish to preserve adequate usable areas. Let's insure this right to enjoy our "way of life" by changing section 9(d) by substituting "shall" for "may" in the first line and the word "reasonable" for "such" and also eliminate "as" in the fourth line.

8. The Advisory Commission created under section 10 is very important—it's the last voice of the people. It is too important to risk becoming a handpicked group by this or any future Secretary. The six members from the towns should be elected or appointed by the selectmen directly and the Governor should appoint his two. The chairman should be elected by themselves. They should be able to call for consultations as well as the Secretary. They should advise on administration and development on all sections of the bill, not just 4, 5, and 6.

9. There should be an added section against competing with local accommodations and services. Preference should be granted locally on concessions where feasible and possible.

Let us now touch on other aspects not included in the wording of H.R. 9050.

The economic study brought out several important predictions. I wish to say that I think this report was conscientiously and impartially made. It predicts a bright economic future for the cape increased materially by the creation of a park. This has been so wherever bigger and bigger crowds have been attracted and will undoubtedly occur here too, despite any unattractive features that go with having crowds we may not sufficiently appreciate. It is what makes Broadway in New York and other downtown business avenues worth thousands of dollars a front foot. We are consoled too in that it will be in the same 3 months that we are crowded to a lesser extent now. The report predicts, "The economic development of the future will probably be in the recreation industry and thus will have the seasonable and moderate personal income that characterizes the present economic base." This confirms the importance I attached above to recreation in regards to section 9 of the bill.

In regard to "in lieu of taxes" it confirms the need. It comments that our "municipal economies are extremely sensitive. This is due to the fact that while their average assessed valuation per capita is extremely high, total assessed values are low. As a result, a comparatively small expenditure or a comparatively small loss of tax revenue has a considerable impact upon their tax rates." It comments this is particularly so in Eastham, Wellfleet, and Truro and further says an analysis of revenue needs "clearly indicates," under any plan of lands acquisition, "a need for payments in lieu of taxes to eliminate any fiscal shock to the communities."

Despite the recommendations in this report paid for by the National Park Service, they sponsored a bill for three parks eliminating these payments. The report suggested a new formula "more equitable" than in lieu payments provided in section 8(c) of S. 2636 and H.R. 9050 but unfortunately missed the point that under certain conditions the payments would be nothing in the first years when most needed and presumably pick and pay out forever after the tax base was broadened and the shock period over. Therefore, I still recommend 5 years' full payments and 20 years with 5 percent reduced each year, for which incidentally there is precedent in the act that established Grand Teton National Park in Wyoming.

At one point the economic survey digresses to gratuitously offer a traffic solution which would create havoc in Eastham—would not be so bad in Wellfleet at present or in Truro and Provincetown. It was to extend the Cape Cod Thruway in a limited access double-barreled road along Route 6 with one park entrance from each town. Let me point out that the present thruway does not divide the business area of any town but skirts it. And in Eastham for its 5½ mile length of Route 6 there would be extensive property damage and the town effectually divided in half—an impossible situation. Wellfleet would later feel the division. In Truro and Provincetown the park takes most everything east of Route 6. But throughout Eastham the thruway should be extended along the railroad to Locust Road and then cut up to Route 6 north of Salt Pond and from there on continue as a parkway through the park at least to the Wellfleet line. Trucking could go on Route 6 at the Salt Pond intersection. However, the parkway should really continue as a terrific park feature as an Ocean Parkway all the way to Provincetown with other park developments tapped off of it. (I submit a map for the use of the committee.)

May I compliment the National Park Service on their memorandum included in the economic report giving their declaration of intent in setting up and administering the park with limitation of camping, protection to property owners, and cooperation with the towns. This cooperation could be well implemented by setting up the Advisory Commission as suggested above and recommended by Congressman Keith. It could be further evidenced by agreement on sore spots in the bill's language and provisions with mutual benefits to both Park Service and the townspeople.

Other matters that must be brief but are, however, no less important are:

1. Eventually the towns will be so built up that sanitation may affect the purity of the water supply. Because of terrain a sanitary sewage system probably requiring treatment stations or polluting beaches would be excessively costly. The less costly and better solution would be a water system with pure supply coming from the park area. Rights should be reserved now in the bill for the towns (as in the proposed Oregon Dunes National Seashore).

2. Money for road widenings and improvements and new roads is not now adequately available. What funds do apply are in terrific competition with other areas. Provision should be made for the Secretary of the Interior to expend funds similar to provisions in the administration bill for the three seashore parks.

3. In some bills it appears the Secretary of the Interior could be interpreted to have the power to approve zoning over the entire towns rather than just the park area to protect improved property status. It should be made clear this invasion of the towns' rights does not pertain. The Secretary should also be made to make public his standards now to see if they are reasonable and allow comment before the bill is passed into law.

4. The bill for the Oregon Park provides for erosion and stabilization. More emphasis should be put on this and development expenditures in H.R. 9050 and S. 2636 rather than just an implied aim of the bill among others. Cooperation of the Army with its harbor dredges could be required. This is highlighted by the loss of nearly a mile of the high protective dunes along Nauset Marsh. This is allowing the high tides to inundate the entire marsh, is sanding over the marsh grass areas, is filling its channels, and impairing its former safe boating and fishing. It is being destroyed for bird refuge and hunting. Incidental to the restoration of protective dunes, channels could be improved, excellent boat harbors created and a refuge harbor supplied where now there is none from Provincetown to Chatham. Channel improvements should be made at Chatham to Pleasant Bay.

Thank you for your kind indulgence.

(Committee note: The following supplemental statement was subsequently received from Mr. Taylor:)

DECEMBER 20, 1960.

Hon. GRACIE PFOST,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands,
House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Supplement to the paper submitted by Harry Taylor on December 17, 1960, at your hearing in Eastham, Mass., on H.R. 9050.

First: I wish to refute the implications of Mr. Thompson of National Park Service, in his comments on December 16, that the tax rates would only be raised as follows: Eastham $0.80, Wellfleet $1.97 and Truro $2.70. Mr. Thompson was quoting column II of the table on "Effect on Tax Rate" on the bottom of page 70 of "An Economic Study" by Economic Development Associates, Inc. (1960). This column only gives the effect of taking vacant land. Since he quotes from this table it is obvious that column I, which gives the effect of the total park taking and therefore the final end result was purposely passed over as were the strong recommendations of the report for in-lieu-of-tax payments. These figures in column I were Eastham $7.92, 20 percent; Wellfleet $13.17, 35 percent; Truro $20.24, 59 percent. Please note my comments in my main paper as to sections 8(a) and 8(b) and the economic report on page 6 of my paper to make repetition unnecessary here.

Second: I wish to refute the impression Mr. Thompson created that there was plenty of land left outside the park area because there is still as much left as was used in the last 300 years, or really 340 years on Cape Cod. If this were so why are the economic reports and planning study basing their findings on practical saturation in 15 years?

Now what are the factors that may leave his statement true but belie the implication behind it?

1. The population density of the United States from 1620 to 1800—the first 180 of these 300 years—the population had grown to 5,368,483. In the next 100 years it increased about 70 million to 75,994,575 (1900). In the next 50 years, to 1950, it doubled to 150,697,361. These are U.S. official Census figures. Since 1950 we have spurted to about 180 million or an increase in the last 10 to 11 years of 30 million or 20 percent. It is only in this last period the building pressure really hit the lower Cape Cod towns affected by the park. In Eastham the value of new seasonal and year-round residences jumped from $318,000 in 1949 to $842,000 in 1959.

2. Other factors that increased the effect on Cape Cod in recent years, instead of evenly over 300 years, are: (a) a large swing from rural to urban within the population totals concentrating growths nearer the cities first, (b) tremendous improvements in cars allowing higher safe traveling speeds, (c) equally high improvements in roads including throughways. Note the Connecticut Thruway and Cape Cod Thruway extension to Eastham were only open for this past summer season, (d) lifespan of this population has increased 15 years in the last 20 thereby perhaps increasing total years of life about 20 percent and terrifically increasing the numbers of older retired persons seeking out the cape—our most important new element as they bring revenue to the area without using up the sparse supply of winter employment, (e) shortened workweek from 6 to 5 days with predicted future 4-day week giving 17 percent more time for recreation

with another 20 percent to come, (f) available transportation, family style, has increased from 31,035,420 cars in 1945 to 68,398,000 in 1958 (U.S. car registrations).

Yes, there are good reasons why Mr. Thompson's references to the last 300 years is meaningless and the boards of selectmen were right in the absolute necessity of holding out of the park takings the moderate areas they requested, even at the sacrifice of eliminating the 10-percent provision in the act for future development.

And do these good reasons prove out? The record shows Eastham had from 1935 to 1955, an increase of 104 percent. The 150 years before that showed from 61 percent to 86 percent (1935–55) except Provincetown, stagnated from lack of land, showed a 10-percent drop.

3. Mr. Thompson for National Park Service said the size of the park was set at a minimum. He further said the other national parks were all larger and Cape Cod as proposed would be the smallest. When asked if they would not accept a smaller area, Mr. Thompson said they would but it would impair the park. I am sorry he was not questioned as to the nature of this impairment as he would have had some trouble substantiating this and it would be easier to rebut.

However, let's check into this very generalized stand. It could be strategic on the theory they might get all and almost surely would get more. But whether it was strategic or not, let's see how it stands up.

As to the first statement that the area was the minimum and the further statement that a smaller size would impair the park:

(*a*) The area comprises 50 square miles. This is 1,393,920,000 square feet. They predict 10 million visitor days which, spread over a 90-day season, averages 111,000 visitors per day. This provides 13,846 square feet for each person. Even to the layman this is obviously an absurd average as a "necessity."

(*b*) As an example, only to give you a measure of what can be done with 1 acre of land—not comparable, in an entirely different field—there are over 400 persons per acre in open area, garden-type, high-rise housing developments in New York City, some, incidentally, subsidized by Federal urban renewal money. Fifty per acre would be preferable, of course, if feasible, but it shows what can be done where there is a will to find a way.

(*c*) A comparable example, however, on active beach area recreation, quite diversified, is Jones Beach on Long Island, N.Y., which accommodates as high as 250,000 people per day. Most of this activity is within 1 mile of its 6-mile length. Its total acreage is 2,413. Cape Cod has 40 miles for half as many people. It would be well worth your committee's investigation to see the passive and active recreation, restoration and development, and real conservation that is included in 14 State parks on Long Island (outside New York City) on 12,397 acres. There is far more of everything needed on Cape Cod in this 12,397 area than National Park Service will ever or should ever put in. Why then the minimum need for 32,000 acres on Cape Cod? It is obviously excessive when contrasted with the towns' needs for future expansion (especially for some top-grade waterfront and water view property to attract higher class development). This would upgrade the towns and is their aim. Hence, all future development could be held to higher standards and produce the type of towns which should border such a magnificent park.

I think it is evident now that the only impairment to the park would be less of the same that it would have an excess of anyway even after the requests of the selectmen (or some compromise thereof) had been met.

(*d*) As to the statement that Cape Cod would be the smallest national park at 32,000 acres, this is but very wrong. There are several immense parks in the sparsely settled and forest area noted by Senator Kennedy in his comments on the bill. There are also smaller, namely: Arcadia, 30,686 acres mostly on an island; Hot Springs, 986 acres; Platt, 912 acres; Virgin Islands, 5,086 acres; Wind Cave, 27,893 acres, and the one and only national seashore, Cape Hatteras, 24,705 acres. There are also eight national historical parks all smaller, although one is over 20,000 acres. There are also 14 national military and battlefield parks smaller.

Now, besides the facts and examples given above, with all due modesty, I refer you to my experience record attached to my main paper submitted December 17 and particularly my association with parks and beach development. I am licensed as a professional engineer. I submit that I am qualified to give a professional opinion on this subject and cannot be dismissed as a layman. It is my opinion after very considerable study and thought that the 32,000 acres in H.R. 9050 could be materially reduced without impairing the park and that the selectmen's line could be taken without serious injury to the park and with marked improvements to the towns' future development.

I submit, also, Van Ness Bates and his associates, backed by the Massachusetts Improvement Association, are issuing a professional report after 4 months study. It is beside the issue whether one agrees with their exact lines in this area, or agrees with the suggested Federal-State joint action or system of regional parks (all of which merit study). The salient point is that they laid out an area in the six affected towns that could be developed into a thoroughly adequate park on far less than 32,000 acres.

A third professional opinion is reflected in the National Park Service original contemplation of an 18,000-acre park. They would never have contemplated such an area if an adequate smaller park than 32,000 acres were not possible.

Let's not gild the lily.

I draw to your attention one other exhibit on this subject—the preliminary land-use plan on the last page of the Park Service's brochure. By far the major passive and active recreation is along the coastline leaving the entire inside of the park almost exclusively an area of biological interest. Now actually this termination is questionable as a matter of something special. There are hills and woods, flat areas and woods and innumerable ponds, a few of special interest (not all glacial potholes). This is repeated over and over. Certainly they do not need 50 square miles of this pretty but not exceptional interior to mainly shut off from natives and public alike because they never could police the whole area. It is mostly interior area with a minor percentage of shoreline on the bay that the towns wish to hold.

Fourth, a few items:

(*a*) Zoning: The park will still be within the town limits and I suggest "the sauce for the goose is good for the gander." It is a strange situation that allows the Secretary to approve town zoning and then willy-nilly put objectionable items in the park. I propose the Secretary be bound also by town zoning against objectionable uses as bars in dry towns. Remember, zoning is easily upset if it is capricious or unreasonable.

(*b*) A glance at the map will show you that Morris Island is cut off by water from approach except through the center of Chatham. Its quaintly charming narrow, however, main street which could not be widened without excessive damage, could not take the traffic that would be generated to the nearest park point to the mainland. Aside from other arguments pro and con, it would be cruel to disrupt the life of Chatham's people. A ride through the town will bear me out. Morris Island is not worth this.

(*c*) Provincetown does need relief by way of added area to prevent it from becoming a future total slum area. How does this work? The process can be traced in any city. The people from the oldest and worst sections move to new modern homes (which also upgrade the entire town). The old vacated homes are torn down and replaced by new homes on combined larger lots. Gradually the whole area has a new lease on life. After a slow start, progress mushrooms. Example: Manhattan's East Side. Provincetown has lots as small as 2,000 square feet on streets the size of alleys. It needs room for even the present population to spread and relieve the present congestion.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY TAYLOR.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you.

The next witness is Mr. Aalto.

STATEMENT OF NESTOR A. AALTO, MASSACHUSETTS COUNCIL OF SPORTSMEN'S CLUBS, INC.

Mr. AALTO. Madam Chairman, my name is Nestor A. Aalto and I represent Massachusetts Council of Sportsmen's Club, Inc. I have been asked that the organizations I represent here be recorded on the records that we are most concerned if a new bill be enacted in the 87th Congress to establish a Cape Cod Seashore Park. Hunting must or shall be allowed in all phases according to the regulations set forth at the time by the Division of Fish and Game of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

If this present bill be enacted that the words, "Secretary may allow hunting," be changed to read, "Secretary shall or must allow hunting in the same seasons or dates as set forth by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Division of Fish and Game."

May I urge that the controlling agency of the Government in charge of this seashore area shall furnish feed patches; also, restocking of game as recommended by the wildlife district manager of this area and suitable law enforcement to protect the wildlife therein as related to the laws of Massachusetts and be responsible for any expenses incurred in carrying out this program.

I would like to comment just one little thing on this pamphlet, "Proposed Cape Cod National Seashore, Tentative Statement of Policy." In the beginning it says:

> The basic concept governing the type of use and the management of the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

The word "unimpaired" kind of disturbs us. It may be that no hunting will be allowed and so forth.

That is just what the interpretation of that would be, we rather question.

Further on page 2, it also states:

> "Opportunities are also excellent for bicycling, camping, photography, sport fishing, sketching, bird watching, research study of natural history, and hunting of migratory waterfowl in designated areas in accordance with the State regulations.

Is that all that will be allowed, just hunting for migratory fowl? What about the upland game of deer and equally partridge and so forth?

We are very much concerned if the park proposal goes through. We are neither for nor against the proposal; we are very much interested if it does go through that hunting will be permitted because the county is very limited in the territory for hunting and it will be detrimental for this area to let the wildlife go unharvested and not be taken care of and will put too much pressure on the part of the county where lands are depleted.

Mrs. Pfost. Are there questions of this group of witnesses? Evidently not.

Thank you very much.

In our next group of witnesses, first will be Mrs. Leroy Wiles, Mrs. Walter Chrysler, and Mrs. Alice Hiscock.

Mrs. Wiles, will you take the witness stand, please?

STATEMENT OF MRS. LEROY WILES, WELLFLEET, MASS.

Mrs. Wiles. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, I am Esther Wiles of Wellfleet. I used to teach school. My ancestors were among the earliest settlers of Cape Cod. In fact, a plat in this hall bears the name of one of them, Richard Higgins. I represent the ordinary citizens of which I am one, so I do not expect that anything I may say will have much, if any, consideration. Still I feel that I would not be true to my heritage if I did not speak. I believe the ordinary citizen should be heard although I am sure the reason more of them do not speak is because they believe it useless to do so.

I bitterly resent giving up my property for tent sites as shown on the map and giving up part of my income and that of my children. It is a most unjust reward for not spoiling our land.

Although much has been said about a Cape Cod National Park, one of the most important things to be considered has been completely left out and that is the moral aspect.

To want something for nothing is basically dishonest. Our Government is offering $16 million for lands and houses which, if sold in the open market, would sell for a far greater price.

If the deeds we hold to our property are valid, we, as citizens of the United States have a right to expect our Government to protect our rights, not to try to wrest it from us for any purpose, except one of absolute necessity.

Our laws are based on the Ten Commandments. This proposed national park flouts three of them. We Cape Codders are a minority group with little political influence so, apparently, it is all right to take from us that which is rightfully owned. Robbery is robbery whether it is done at the point of a gun or by legislation. In fact, the former is preferable, since we might have a chance of recovering some of it. No park is worth this price, when we have to rob our citizens to get it and deny to their children and grandchildren the right to their inheritance.

No one should have anything to say about this park except those whose land and homes are affected. I find that those who are for it are, for the most part, those who are contributing nothing to it and expect to gain at the cost to others. It is easy to give away what is not theirs. If they find their property involved, then they are not for the park. Examples, Morris Island and Harding's Beach. Many of these people are for the park as long as their property is left out. Let the lower cape make the sacrifices.

This proposed park is being sold to the people as a seashore park which is "false witness." Much of the interior is being taken where our homes and summer cottages are, taking away our incomes and revenue of our towns. Of course, if our income is taken away, who will benefit? These newly erected strategically placed motels, just outside the park, and personnel to administer the park and concessionaires. It would be interesting to know just how much pressure has been applied by motel owners and concession people. Maybe it should be investigated. As for the 10 percent kickback, that is a political gimmick if there ever was one.

The last Commandment which is being flouted is "Thou shall not covet." To preserve our beaches and dunes is one thing as a good part of them are already publicly owned and part is a question of ownership. This proposed park is much too large for the area involved. Why cast covetous eyes just at towns on the lower cape, why not go whole hog while we are about it and include all along the Nantucket Sound where the population is much greater and would be of much greater benefit to more people as it would be much nearer?

Respect for property rights of people goes way back to Biblical days. Our greatest President, Abraham Lincoln, looked to the Bible for guidance and it might be well if others read the account of King Ahab coveting the land of Naboth and profit thereby, account found in First Kings, chapter 21. At least Naboth was offered a fair deal.

Eminent domain never was intended as a tool for some politician. It was only intended to be used so that a few people could not block such public services as a railroad, telephone lines, or a road going through, where it was necessary to have a continuous way. Today eminent domain is much abused and what we need is legislation to put a curb on this right to take people's property for any sleazy excuse.

We are not fighting just for the right to our own homes, but to the right of every American to his home, for if this park goes through as proposed, a precedent will be set for the taking of any well-populated area and no home in the United States will be safe from seizure by our Government.

There is another way out of this dilemma. If the Government wishes to preserve the lower cape as it is, then let it take over the dunes and coast for not more than one-half mile inland, greater area if it is just dunes and wasteland, skipping the built up areas, then let the Government pay the citizens who own the rest of the proposed park land an easement, which would mean that the Government, or still better, the town, buys a right in the property to preserve its scenic beauty. The property would still belong to the owner. He could sell it or pass it on to his heirs, but he could not subdivide it, bulldoze it or spoil its beauty. This easement would apply to any future owners. This, to my mind, would be the most fair way of preserving this area. The people would still own their land and the Government could not give concessions, build buildings of various types or chop it into tent sites and there would not be expensive personnel for the taxpayers to support. The town would still benefit by the taxes. If the Government is really sincere in its desire to preserve this area, this would accomplish the result in a truly democratic way. Where is the money coming from? How about some of these foundations? It is my earnest desire that this solution be given your earnest consideration.

I thank you.

Mrs. Pfost. Mrs. Chrysler?

STATEMENT OF MRS. WALTER P. CHRYSLER, JR., NORTH TRURO, MASS.

Mrs. Chrysler. Madam Chairman, members of the committee, and Congressman Keith, my name is Mrs. Walter P. Chrysler, Jr., and I temporarily reside in North Truro.

As the wife of a substantial property owner in Wellfleet and Provincetown, I am here to protest, in as emphatic a manner as I can, the seizure of privately owned property on Cape Cod by the National Park Service for a national seashore.

This seizure of property, however adequate or inadequate the compensation may be, represents a form of destruction of the inalienable rights of a citizen to own, improve, dispose of, bequeath, or will private property. This destruction of an individual's right and security is in opposition to all democratic principles which encourage an individual to establish a home, and own it, a business, and to become an integral part of his community's social, civic and religious life. This relationship is not only for himself, but should be able to extend into future generations.

I object to Government usurpation anywhere—Cape Cod or any other place in the United States—unless this land which the Federal Government presently plans to own is clearly available without any deprivation of or infringement on individual rights of ownership. If the Federal Government continues on this program as outlined by the National Park Service, will there be any security for any of us? Are we to be allowed to be only custodians of land until such time as we are told to give it up to allow Federal ownership and be told to get off at Government-defined values? Must we be moved around at the whims of political opportunists?

The National Park Service talks conservation from one side of its face—and then from the other side comes the real reason for the taking of this acreage on Cape Cod—recreation. These two words should never be used in the same breath and have any honest meaning. This business of increasing our recreational areas, like any other bureaucratic activity, can get out of hand.

There are no outstanding wonders on Cape Cod. The real charm lies in the fact that it is a community, or a way of life. Cape Cod is not an industrial community, nor is it an agricultural one; it is essentially residential. It is a community of homeowners, engaging in trades of their individual talents to provide for their financial requirements, and implementing their income by attracting summer tourists, retired persons, and others of financial means. Many of these businessmen would prefer and greatly encourage an opportunity for year-round activity such as would result from an increase of year-round residents. Many individuals who could retire to Cape Cod do not necessarily want to live on a 50- by 90-foot lot. We should not all be forced to conform to a Government standard for our needs and desires, and we should be permitted to live within the ability of our individual incomes.

It has been rumored and variously quoted as an integral part of the proposed bill that we will be given life tenure or life right to 3 acres of land which we already completely own as a sop to keep us quiet while the Federal Government grabs the permanent possession and acreage away from us. Who are the people? Are we the people? Or, is the Federal Government the people? And whose rights are to be protected?

In the recent presidential campaigns by both candidates, Abraham Lincoln was quoted as having said, "In all that people can do for themselves, the Government ought not to interfere."

To be certain that there would be no peace and quiet in the future for residents on Cape Cod, the Federal Government contributed enormous sums of money to build the Mid Cape Highway opening up to and bringing unlimited and often undesirable masses of people into the areas which the taxpayers previously had controlled and preserved pretty well in a state of simple natural charm and beauty in the finest New England tradition. This Mid Cape Highway, with the completed and anticipated links to it, will bring Cape Cod into accessibility by road to about one-third of the entire population of the United States and our Canadian neighbors, within 12 to 24 hours' motoring. God help us if they all arrive at the same time with their hot dogs and bottles of pop.

This planning by the Federal Government, over a long period of time, to make Cape Cod a cheap vacation playground has no respect for the individual landowner and taxpayer, or for preserving the type of community he wishes it to be.

The term "vanishing shoreline" is a very accurate phrase to describe what is to happen to this area made accessible to an estimated 40 million people who can plan to invade the Cape with nothing more in their jeans than to pay for the gasoline home, leaving their trash and refuse as a grim reminder of their visit.

The National Park Service is constantly begging Congress for more funds to even adequately police existing properties under its jurisdiction. Why then add acreage to their burdens?

Since the Federal Government already owns large acreage on Cape Cod, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts also owns great acreages here and elsewhere in Massachusetts, why not use this already available land for whatever needs the National Park Service feels are so necessary for the bird-watchers or campers with no further disturbance to the individuals who wish to occupy their own property in privacy and peace away from multitudes of people a national park would attract?

We feel very strongly that our municipal governments are extremely capable of conducting the affairs of the areas. Living with local problems makes you better qualified to decide solutions for them. We do not need the advice of, nor the assistance from a Government office in Washington to tell us what is best for Cape Cod—or how to conserve it.

This action on the part of the Federal Government needs a concentration of thought of the principle involved—that of depriving a private citizen of his God-given right to own land of his choice and to dispose of it as he may deem advisable during his lifetime or upon his death without interference by the Federal Government.

I am a relative newcomer to Cape Cod, but this bill puts newcomers and "old timers" on an equal footing. I am a woman fighting for the home of my choice on the land of my choice, and that of my neighbors and friends.

Madam Chairman, I most earnestly implore you and the members of your committee, as well as all Members of the Congress to defeat this bill and all similar bills now and whenever they might arise.

Thank you. [Applause.]

Mrs. PFOST. Our next witness is Mrs. Alice Hiscock.

STATEMENT OF ALICE HISCOCK, MEMBER, CHATHAM PLANNING BOARD, CHATHAM, MASS.

Mrs. HISCOCK. Madam Chairman and members of the committee, Congressman Keith. I hadn't intended to speak at this hearing. I sat through all the hearings last year, and I had thought that enough had been said, but this time I have heard a great many things said against the park and as one who is for it, I think you should hear some other points.

My name is Alice Hiscock. I have served six years as a member of Chatham Planning Board. I am not a native Cape Codder, but I might be called a native who returned inasmuch as my ancestors were among those first to set foot in Provincetown and moved to Plymouth. However, it is perhaps because I have lived elsewhere and have chosen to come to Cape Cod, I see in it something those who live here don't see—apparently they don't see the sunset reflected on the beach, glory of the dunes. To be able to see and look at these things is one reason we came here. In fact, we lived in Washington, I know it well. When we decided to leave, we decided to look—because my husband had been at sea and knew the sea—for a place where we could go and be near the sea and have space. We had to come all the way to Cape Cod to find just exactly the answer to that question.

Now, the question has been raised about the millions of people who are coming here for the park. In my estimation, those millions are coming here anyway. We have nearly so many people in driving distance.

Population growth, the explosion of population, has not been mentioned. It has just been mentioned that people will come. More people will come inevitably, and we must be prepared for it.

Now, the fact is that there are planning boards and zoning in all of the towns in the area. In fact, now all of the towns on the cape have it. However, it has been a great struggle, as those of you live here know, to get zoning at all. In Chatham, as a matter of fact, we have had it only 6 years, and in that time three efforts have been made to throw it out entirely. It is still a very tight question as to how much more zoning we can do and in my estimation, the zoning standards that have been established on the cape are on the suburban level. They are not on the spacious level you might expect in an area which still has large areas, spaces of land where people are living on considerably large acreage. Therefore, although we have zoning, it is not going to preserve the appearance of the cape as it is now.

There is further a great pressure to have strip zoning along the two highways, that is Route 6 in this area and Route 28 on the lower shore of the cape, for commercial purposes and having been trained as an architect in Cape Cod myself, although I no longer practice it, I know that is not good planning. We on boards locally are under great pressure from local people and from those who buy from local people. I can't blame it all on the local inhabitants because they sell to others. We are under great pressure to develop commercially lands already partially zoned or to be zoned for business purposes.

This is something that whether the park comes or not, we are faced with. Now, in my estimation, there is too much pressure on those of us locally, and we feel it all the time, to do the type of job that the Federal Government can do because their picture is larger. Although we have a conservation commission in several towns, we cannot act with the magnitude of vision that the Federal Government can. It seems to me that to change in any way the boundaries suggested by the park by puncturing holes here and there for development purposes is a great mistake. I realize that this will mean great sacrifice to certain people in some towns. This has happened before in large Federal projects. There have been dams that have been built that have destroyed whole towns. The St. Lawrence Seaway destroyed some towns along the shore. It is very difficult when you are one of those who are touched and I admit my own property is not within the park, although I view it. It is very difficult to be one of those who must be sacrificed, but I think we must look not 5 years, 10 years, but 50 years ahead, where the population reaches the point where there will be standing room only and I feel that only with a park of the size that is recommended by the National Park Service can we have one that is worth having.

There are one or two comments I would like to make particularly relative to the Chatham area. Yesterday, there was a statement made that Chatham built the dike. I am sure the committee knows that the Federal Government and the State government together paid for 90 percent of the dike. The town of Chatham contributed about 10 percent, so it could hardly be said that Chatham built the dike and the purpose of the dike was not for the purpose of connecting Morris Island and Stage Island. It was for the preservation of Stage Harbor and it was because the harbor needed to be dredged and the Federal Government would not do it until the town made up its mind—and it took them 12 years or more to do it—what they wanted to have happen to the sand and the dike was finally built. And we were assured there would be no road over the dike and the island could not be developed.

For some reason which has never been explained, when the specifications were written it was written there would be a road across the dike and since then the properties there have been planned and are on record for development of 70 homes or more. To say there will not be a traffic problem with the construction and maintenance of 70 homes on Morris Island is to me a little bit foolish. We have a problem there of traffic which I do not know that the town has even considered solving. It is very bad as it is now. We have a very dangerous corner at the approach to Morris Island Road and I do not believe anyone has suggested there would be a solution to this, if 70 homes were built there. I feel to make it into a wildlife sanctuary in connection with Monomay would not invite the same kind of traffic that we will be faced with should it be developed and certainly, although $50,000 sounds like a great deal of taxation to receive from Morris Island, there are literally hundreds of undeveloped acres of land in Chatham.

Just a week ago, I drove over some of the back-lane country—and we will try to raise the building standards in that area slightly at the coming town meeting—but you can drive for a great many miles there and not see a house and it is beautiful land. Granted it is not shorefront, but there is still a great deal of very good, taxable property in the town so it is not absolutely essential and 10 years ago nobody would have ever thought of a development of the kind that is proposed on Morris Island.

I do not want to take any more of your time, but I felt I should get a few things on record, thank you.

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you very much, Mrs. Hiscock.

Are there questions of this last panel of witnesses?

Judge Chenoweth of Colorado wishes to make an observation.

Mr. Chenoweth. I wanted to say this to Mrs. Chrysler. I couldn't let her appear as a witness without making this observation. First, I want to commend her for a very splendid statement. Certainly, she has expressed the American way of life.

Her father-in-law came from my hometown, Trinidad, Colo., as a young man, as foreman for Colorado & Southern Railway Co. So we feel in a way the Chrysler family has a root in Colorado and in my hometown of Trinidad, and this is a matter of great pride to us. I have used the name of Chrysler many times as an example of what can be done in the great free enterprise system we have in America, when a man like Walter P. Chrysler, who came to Trinidad as a poor man, but who had great mechanical genius, was able later in life to establish one of the largest automobile industries in this country.

I thought I should make that observation to you, Mrs. Chrysler, because of our great close association and contact with the Chryslers in Colorado.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you, Judge Chenoweth. Are there further observations or questions?

Thank you, ladies, for your statements.

We have one final witness, Mr. Bertram Courier, who requested just a few moments ago to be heard. In view of our limited schedule, it will be necessary, Mr. Courier, to limit your testimony to 5 minutes.

Mr. COURIER. 3 minutes.

Mrs. PFOST. All right; that is wonderful. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF BERTRAM COURIER

Mr. COURIER. I want to thank the committee for letting me voice my opposition to this whole national park bill. I do not mean to be unfair and I do not want to be personal, but I do want to say that I wrote six letters to the sponsors of this bill asking when the hearings were going to take place, and saying that I wanted to be heard. I never even had the courtesy of a reply from Senator Kennedy, I got one reply from Senator Saltonstall, and Mr. Keith did send me two replies, but he never did tell me when the hearing was going to be.

I consider this bill extremely unfair and un-American. First of all, it says that people can have their homes for 20 years, as though the family was not an integral part of the United States, and the American way of life. If the family is going to terminate at the end of 25 years, if you have children who want to live there—my children have places down here—what is it going to be if their children can't have the places?

We moved down here because it is residential, a beautiful residential section. We don't mind some people coming in; we like them. They do have problems down here. Nauset Beach out here, the big beach out here, is a wonderful asset. There is no question about it. I think it can be handled much, much better by local people.

Mr. Frazier and the selectmen in Wellfleet have done an excellent job. They know the problems, understand the problems, and are sincerely interested in solving them.

I do not want to take any more time then I have to, but I want to say another thing. It has been mentioned previously during the hearings that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is bankrupt. These towns down here are not too well off. The Federal Government is in debt for $290 billion. I do not see how the Commonwealth of Massachusetts can afford to let this income-producing property go, this property which is supported by people outside of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts through taxes, which goes to help support the schools and the roads and the public facilities. I do not see how the Commonwealth of Massachusetts can sit back and say, "Let all of this income and all of this money coming into the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to support these areas." I do not see how they can sit back and say, "We don't care." The Commonwealth of Massachusetts needs this money. If we had any kind of leadership in Massachusetts we would realize it. We wouldn't just throw away this money.

Two more things and I am going to quit. I have a lot more I could say, but just two things.

First of all, with our national debt of $290 billion can we afford to be on any more socialistic, democratic meanderings, and projects? Can we afford this? Where is the money coming from? If you take away the basis for income-producing down here by destroying people and individuals and their families, where is the money coming from? It doesn't grow on trees.

Second, Germany had this kind of a bill, which I consider a socialistic bill that wants to take care of everybody; Germany was a social democracy before the war. They have gone the way of individual rights and individual freedom and individual liberties and they are now wealthy. We have gone the other way and you can see what has happened to our prestige and our power in the world.

The more we destroy individual enterprise and individual initiative and destroy individual rights, the farther we are stepping along the road to self-destruction that Germany did and the same results will happen to us.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Mrs. Pfost. Thank you, Mr. Courier.

I am sorry you did not direct your questions regarding the hearings to our subcommittee. We had charge of setting the dates for the hearings. Had you done that, I am sure you would have been advised by letter. The authors of the bill did not have the jurisdiction over the exact date that we were going to hold hearings.

Mr. Courier. I see.

Mrs. Pfost. The Chair would like to ask unanimous consent that 26 letters, wires, and other communications favoring the establishment of the national seashore park, 12 opposed and 5 other statements be incorporated in the record. Is there objection?

Hearing none, it is so ordered.

(Committee Note.—These documents may be found in the appendix.)

Mrs. Pfost. I should also like to ask unanimous consent that further statements and supplemental statements be incorporated in the record provided they are received no later than December 23. Is there objection to this unanimous consent request? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

(Committee Note.—These documents may be found in appendix.)

Mrs. Pfost. This brings to a close our hearings here on the cape. The Chair would wish to express appreciation to the audience for its fine cooperation during the past 2 days and particularly to the witnesses who have conformed by making short statements and have allowed us to stay within our limited time for hearings.

I would also like to express, on behalf of the committee, our appreciation to the many townspeople who have made our stay so pleasant. The many courtesies that have been extended to the committee members, as well as to our staff members, are appreciated.

Let me assure those of you who have expressed concern whether or not personal statements would be given consideration, or whether they were welcome—let me assure you that that is exactly why this subcommittee is here on the cape. We could have held these hearings in Washington, D.C., and not have taken the trouble to come up here to hear the personal expressions and to view the area involved. We are very happy to have these individual statements and they will be given consideration at the time the legislation is considered during the 87th Congress.

On behalf of the committee, I would like to express a special thanks to the board of selectmen of Eastham for providing this wonderful hall in which we have held our hearings for the past couple of days.

Our particular thanks also go to Colonel White of the U.S. Air Force for the use of the helicopter from Otis Field, which he provided to us to view from the air the area that is involved in the national seashore legislation.

I believe that this concludes the statements for the Chair, but I should like to ask if any member of the committee wishes to say anything further.

Mr. KEITH. On behalf of the constituents of the Ninth Congressional District, I would like to express their thanks for your interest in our problem and tell you that we are grateful for the sacrifice you have made in coming here. We are hopeful that the light which has been shed on this entire proposal will be beneficial to the cape and to our country.

Mrs. PFOST. Thank you, Mr. Keith.

These have been very constructive days, believe me, for members of the committee. We have assembled a wealth of material and opinions. Let me assure you again that your opinions will be given serious consideration not only by those members who found it possible to be here, but also by other members of our subcommittee who desired to come but who for various reasons were unable to do so. Your opinions and statements will be incorporated in the record of the hearings, providing members of the committee at that time grant a unanimous consent request that they be embodied with next year's record.

A million thanks to all of you for a very wonderful 3 days spent in a very beautiful area of our country. [Applause.]

The subcommittee is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 1:35 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.)

APPENDIX

MASSACHUSETTS DIVISION, AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., December 15, 1960.

Hon. GRACIE PFOST,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Town Hall, Eastham, Mass.

DEAR MRS. PFOST: The New England Conference of AAA Clubs is in favor of prompt establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

This seashore park gives us an opportunity to preserve a unique and historic section of the American seacoast. It is also an opportunity to provide an important recreational facility for the people of New England and the Nation and, at the same time, strengthen our region's economy.

The conference is composed of 12 AAA motor clubs with a total of 26 offices in the 6 New England States and directly represents 350,000 New England motorists, while working toward the best interests of all motorists.

We strongly urge you to take the necessary action so that legislation is passed soon for the national seashore park.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. HOOVER, *Secretary-Treasurer,*
New England Conference of AAA Clubs.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman of House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF YOUR COMMITTEE: I do not approve of the proposed legislation to authorize the Department of the Interior to establish a national seashore park on Cape Cod, for the same reason I am opposed to all schemes to spend tax money, National, State, or local, on projects which are not necessary.

All such expenditures cannot amount to anything beneficial to the spenders or the localities where they are disbursed.

I am amazed by the awful waste of tax proceeds by the U.S. Government.

I am astounded as I behold the careless indifference displayed by the administration, and by our elected Representatives in Congress.

I am astonished and saddened at their lack of judgment. They do not seem to know, at least they will not apply the simplest rudimentary principles of finance.

If the House allows this bill to pass it will cause untold harm to Cape Cod, if indeed it does not completely ruin our economic status as it stands today.

CHARLES L. AYLING (retired),
Former Founder and President of Barnstable County National Bank and Director of John Hancock Life Insurance Co.

PLYMOUTH, MASS., *December 15, 1960.*

Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Eastham Town Hall, Eastham, Mass.:

The Massachusetts Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc., representing over 10,000 sportsmen has repeatedly and unanimously favored the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

Massachusetts sportsmen want their natural resources used wisely for the benefit of all for the longest possible time. We know that the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park would accomplish this in a fair and equitable manner.

We urge prompt and favorable consideration for the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

EMMET B. BAKER, *President,*
Massachusetts Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Inc.

MEMORANDUM

NEW BEDFORD, MASS., *November 29, 1960.*

Re Cape Cod National Seashore Park, a proposal.

Hon. GRACIE PFOST,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Subsequent to reading press release from House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, dated November 22, 1960, I forward herewith a proposal, copies of which I have sent to chairman, Board of Selectmen, towns of Provincetown, Truro, Wellfleet, Eastham, Orleans, and Chatham, Cape Cod, Mass.

Respectfully,

Rear Adm. WILLIAM W. BALL,
U.S. Naval Reserve, Retired, Master Mariner.

NEW BEDFORD, MASS., *October 20, 1960.*

Re Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

Hon. HASTINGS KEITH,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KEITH: To establish for health and recreation a summer residence on Cape Cod, my forebears in 1890 acquired an eastern seashore area in the town of Truro. On this inhospitable and then uninhabited coast we perceived a small haven for wildlife, learned to cherish nature's own unspoiled topography, encouraged the nonresident taxpayer, and plead for local zoning.

I am certain we look forward to the establishment of a Cape Cod National Seashore Park; it will avoid a calamity.

The two conspicuous objections to establishment appear to be loss of taxable property and opening of so large an area to general public use.

Proposal, attached hereto in outline, suggests limiting the width of the acquisition to approximately one-half mile and further suggests the entire approximate 40-mile strip be closed in the interest of conservation, except as regulated for the minimal, yet exceptionally excellent recreational use indicated.

The unrehearsed detail of the proposal is my own, not necessarily legally permissive, nor known to be most desirable from the viewpoint of the National Park Service.

I appreciate your letter of 8 August, same subject.

Sincerely yours,

Rear Adm. WILLIAM W. BALL,
U.S. Naval Reserve, Retired, Master Mariner.

A PROPOSAL—CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK

ESTABLISHMENT

1. Acquire a continuous and unbroken strip of beach and contiguous backland approximately one-half mile wide, westward from the high-water mark of Cape Cod's eastern seashore, and from Race Point, Provincetown, southward to the terminal tip of the sandspit, which separates Pleasant Bay from the Atlantic Ocean, at Chatham.
2. Securely fence and mark its irregular western limit against prohibited use of beach and backland.

3. Build gatehouses on the western limit at the approximately six natural low-level approaches to the beach for year-round control of entrance and exit, and between June 15 and September 15 for collection of a single, day-use, nominal, recreational-facilities-maintenance fee.

4. Build comfort station, parking area, and lifeguard observation tower at each public ocean beach; and within the strip build appropriate structures for federally deputized patrol of the entire strip by air and by land conveyance.

5. As the acquisition, in the public interest, is primarily conservation of approximately 40 miles of seashore-backland and associated wildlife, the beach and supporting backland is not to be opened to any public recreational use other than: along the shore, seabathing and surfcasting, and within the backland, picnicking; nor to any hunting season, nor to any commercial installation, nor to any unregulated public use, nor to any public convenience other than sanitary.

6. During the period of acquisition and individually until such time as the resultant temporary occupancy agreements with current landowners expire, issue each privileged landowner annually an entrance-exit identification, so that entrance-exit privilege to the strip without or within the fee season shall be, in the public interest, enforced and controlled at the earliest possible date after enactment of legislation authorizing establishment of the seashore park.

7. All permanent employees associated with the seashore park shall be Federal employees.

ACREAGE

8. Inasmuch as local and nonresident enterprise has upped the land price ratio sharply since the year 1950 and even more sharply since a national park project received publicity, and there are so many small-bit acres to be picked up by the Public Treasury it appears desirable, in fairness to the greatest number, to establish a single backdated price-per-acre irrespective of location or topography and compel adherence thereto in negotiation throughout. However, in land negotiation attach no value to either buildings, structures, or facilities.

BUILDINGS

9. All buildings and/or facilities, private and/or commercial, shall be negotiated for separately and without relation to the negotiation for the land on which they rest, and shall be removed from the strip prior to the termination of an individually indicated period of grace hereafter described, or abandoned to appropriate use or demolition by the Federal Government.

OWNER-RESIDENT USE PRIVILEGE

10. Establish a resident domicile-only use privilege under existing ownership: Deny this privilege to all transfers of ownership since the year 1950, except that owners actually occupying, one domicile and only one summer and/or winter may continue occupancy for a period of 5 years from the date the measure for acquisition of the land is signed into law; except further that ownership prior to and including the year 1950 shall not be so denied, but such owners may continue occupancy, use of an extant domicile, during the life of the senior family members or member present but not to include any direct or related offspring, other descendant or other person to whom the land upon which the domicile rests might subsequently come as a gift or inheritance; and these resident use privileges shall include one domicile and only one within the strip for each principal so privileged.

RESIDENTIAL RENTALS

11. Owners, prior to 1950 or subsequent thereto, of residential-rentals, for all year or seasonal occupancy shall be granted upon request a period of grace for removal of or vacating the buildings not to exceed 5 years.

COMMERCIAL

12. Commercial enterprises, businesses, and/or facilities, as distinguished from residential-rentals, shall be removed from the strip or vacated within 1 year from the date the measure for acquisition of the land is signed into law.

PAYMENT TO DISPOSSESSED

The Federal Government shall proceed immediately upon enactment of legislation authorizing the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park to acquire desired acreage, clear the land, fence and mark its western limit, set up desired Federal structures for its administration, and indemnify proven owners as follows:

13. The indemnification for all commercial buildings and/or facilities, as distinguished from residential-rentals, and coincidentally but separately for the land upon which the enterprise rests shall be negotiated forthwith and payment made within 1 year. (See pars. 9 and 12 above.)

14. The indemnification for all acreage-land throughout the strip, other than that taken under paragraph 13 above (see also par. 8 above) shall be negotiated forthwith and payment made within 2 years.

15. The indemnification for owner-residences, summer and/or winter, privileged to use their premises a given period not to exceed 5 grace years shall be negotiated forthwith and payment made within 3 years. (See par. 10, first part.)

16. The indemnification for owner-residences, summer and/or winter, privileged under life tenure shall be negotiated forthwith and payment made within 4 years. (See par. 10, second part.)

17. The indemnification for residential-rentals, yearly or seasonal occupancy shall be negotiated forthwith and payment made within 5 years. (See par. 11.)

PURPOSE

The Cape Cod National Seashore Park shall be within 5 years of the date it is written into law a fenced in, nonviolate, federally secured area; the conservation of a magnificent seashore together with its natural backland, a sanctuary for associated wildlife, and a regulated public recreational area.

THE BARNSTABLE COUNTY NATIONAL BANK,
Hyannis, Mass., December 12, 1960.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I wish to be recorded opposed to House bill No. 9050 (national seashore park) for the following reasons:

First: The cost of purchasing this property alone is staggering. There, undoubtedly, would be many claims before finally getting the actual cost down in black and white and the cost to the taxpayers will only compound the initial cost.

Second: I was born here on the cape 60-odd years ago and I have driven up and down the outside beach and also visited along the upland many times all the way from Nauset Point to Race Point at different times of the year, and I have observed that no one uses the beach for bathing purposes because of the undercurrent, high surf, and cold water.

Third: The area, if made into a park—and I do not know what your idea of a park would be even though I have heard several conflicting stories as to what you propose to do to create a park, so-called—would only be used at the most 2 months out of the year, and I assume, that would be by people parking in cars or living in tents and possibly cottages which you may propose to build.

Of course, some people would be on the beach; however, all the towns now provide public beaches and supervise them. In some cases the towns have enlarged their parking areas and beach facilities if the demand was sufficient. Just how do you feel the public would benefit by Federal management over local management? It certainy will cost the taxpayers more money, as most of the towns now employ school teachers to supervise the beaches; whereas, the Federal Government will undoubtedly have year-round employees.

I would suggest that you look at a map of Cape Cod and see the areas that are now owned by the Federal Government, by our State government, and by our local towns. You will find the area is vast. So, why do you really need any more? In fact, why don't you do more toward developing Monomoy Point, for instance.

I think you will agree there is every reason for our local town governments to properly supervise and provide all the beaches needed, both now and in the future as our resort business represents about 75 to 80 percent of Cape Cod's income.

The above reasons for my being opposed to this bill are but a few of the many.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

WALCOTT AMES.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED APRIL 19, 1960

BARNSTABLE TOWN HALL,
Hyannis, Mass.

Whereas our Representative in Congress, Hastings Keith, and Senators Leverett Saltonstall and John F. Kennedy, have sponsored a bill in Congress (S. 2636) proposing, through the medium of the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of Interior and Insular Affairs, to establish a National Seashore Park on Cape Cod, and, although we believe our elected Representatives in Congress have acted in good faith, we nevertheless, are firmly convinced they have made a grave mistake. It is evident that beyond all doubt they have been misled and deceived as to the true facts concerning this proposal, by certain personnel connected with the National Park Service who through unbounded enthusiasm, uncurbed exuberance, and superficial reasoning backed up by scholarly writers have presented what appears to be a plausible case; but if the bill should be enacted into law, it would be sure to defeat it's own purpose. And, whereas we, the undersigned citizens of Cape Cod, being fully aware that a vast majority of our people recognize the danger to themselves and posterity and feel great apprehension and real grief, we hereby firmly:

Resolve, To do all in our power to prevent the passage of this proposed law by going to Washington—all who can afford to—and under the leadership of our former Representative, Donald W. Nicholson, appearing before the several committees before which the bills must be heard; and we further

Resolve and pledge ourselves to urge others to also go to Washington.

And further we pledge ourselves to urge upon all people, resident and nonresident alike, to write at once to Wayne N. Aspinall, chairman of House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, and to Representative Keith and Senators Kennedy and Saltonstall, Washington, D.C., protesting the passage of this act in it's entirety without any amendments or modifications whatsoever. This is very important; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be filed in the Barnstable archives as an unofficial record in the town clerk's office in order that posterity may know that we, now living, did not surrender their birthright without a struggle.

Chester A. Crocker, selectman and assessor, 1929–50.
Nathan Ellis, surveyor of highways, town of Falmouth.
Donald W. Nicholson, former selectman of Wareham, Massachusetts House of Representatives; president, Massachusetts Senate; and Representative in Congress.
George L. Cross, selectman and assessor, town of Barnstable.
William R. Crump, former selectman, town of Bourne.
Edwin F. Eldredge, former selectman, town of Chatham.
Kenneth Turner, master plumber and civic leader of Cotuit.
Edward E. Millikin, chairman, conservation commission, town of Eastham.
Walcott Ames, president, Barnstable County National Bank.
Maurice A. Moore, member, planning board and Republican town committee, Town of Eastham.
Leonard C. Pierce, selectman and assessor, town of Wellfleet.
Charles E. Frazer Jr., selectman, assessor and attorney, town of Wellfleet.
Prescott B. Cummings, planning board chairman, town of Eastham.
William B. Fleming, town of Wellfleet.
Cyril W. Downs, president, Wellfleet Savings Bank.
Antone Duarte, Jr., former selectman, town of Truro.
Elwood O. Mills, selectman and deputy sheriff, town of Mashpee.
Frank C. Ryder, cashier, First National Bank of Yarmouth.
Lawrence F. Crocker, finance committee chairman, town of Brewster.
Allen F. Jones, Barnstable legislator.

Channing E. Hoxie, town clerk, treasurer and tax collector, town of Sandwich
Joseph F. Bazzinotti, former selectman, Sandwich.
Walter B. Chase, former president, Hyannis Trust Co.
James F. Pendergast, Hyannis Inn, Hyannis, Mass.
Charles L. Hamblin, former contractor and builder, Lantana, Fla.
Gilbert F. Smith, selectman, Sandwich, Mass.
Carl H. Hiler, clerk, board of selectmen, Sandwich, Mass.
Alvan H. Crocker, general contractor, Sandwich, Mass.
Norman E. Williams, plumbing and heating contractor, Falmouth, Mass.
John P. Sylvia, Jr., attorney at law, Falmouth, Mass.
Harold L. Baker, chief of police, Falmouth, Mass.
Ann B. Richardson, Elm Arch Inn, Falmouth, Mass.
Hoyt L. Savery, auto dealer, Falmouth, Mass.
Roger L. Savery, auto dealer, Falmouth, Mass.
Frederick W. Wormelle, Jr., president, Falmouth Marine Railway, Inc.
Hilding S. Hord, Race Lane, Marstons Mills.
Wilton B. Crosby, president, Crosby Yacht Building & Storage Co., Inc.
Chester A. Crosby, Harbor Master, Town of Barnstable.
Victor F. Adams, chairman board of selectmen, Barnstable.
Howard W. Sears, town clerk and treasurer, Barnstable.
Harry A. Jenkins, general manager, Oyster Harbors, Barnstable.
Clarence M. Chase, former town clerk and treasurer, 37 years, Barnstable.
Gerard C. Besse, president, Hyannis Trust Co.
Henry L. Murphy, judge, first district court of Barnstable (Centerville).
Artemas G. Griffin, mason contractor, Marstons Mills, Mass.
Charles N. Libby, Farm Bureau agent, Cape Cod.
Hyman Burman, merchant, Barnstable, Mass.
Henry A. Ellis, attorney at law, member of general court, 8 years, town moderator, 21 years, Hyannis, Mass.
E. Thomas Murphy, selectman and assessor, town of Barnstable.
Dr. Madaline Winslow, Truro, Mass.
George W. Foster, selectman and assessor, town of Brewster.
Lawrence A. Baker, chairman of selectmen, town of Brewster.
Fred H. Nash, chairman of public welfare and selectman, Brewster.

Received and filed in the clerk's office of the town of Barnstable on June 9, 1960.

A true copy.
Attest: HOWARD W. SEARS, *Town Clerk.*

HYANNIS, MASS.

Congresswoman GRACIE PFOST,
Town Hall,
Eastham, Mass.:

The county commissioners of Barnstable County state that their views and recommendations remain the same as set forth on pages 147 and 148 of the report of the Senate subcommittee hearings held on December 9 and 10, 1959.

KENNTH E. WILSON,
Counsel for the County Commissioners.

CHATHAM, MASS., *December 28, 1960.*

Reference: The Cape Cod Seashore Park bills, your hearing, Eastham, Mass., December 15 and 16.

Mr. WAYNE N. ASPINALL.
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a native of Chatham, for 54 years, high school graduate, licensed radio telegraphist, who has served the merchant marine and even Interior with the U.S. Antarctic Service of 1939–41 including a couple of trips to Alaska tween the two trips to Antarctica, and now ashore for good working with the Cape Cod mosquito control project. My work takes me throughout the towns of Provincetown, Truro, Wellfleet, Eastham, Orleans, and the Nauset Beach of Orleans and Chatham.

We go forth with our four-wheeled-drive Ford through the fields, lanes, roads (public and private), to get to the mosquito areas, of which there are many, in the Herring River Valley of Wellfleet, the Pamet River Valley of Truro, the Pilgrim Park area, the Province Lands and the actual beach areas south of Nauset USCG station and south of the Orleans parking lot through to area south of the USCG Old Harbor Station in Chatham. You name it, we go there! The old cape highway to Provincetown followed the high land, and it was only the new highway that walked through straightaway, filling in the intervening swamps. We still have the main business street of Wellfleet on the ridge tween two swamps. Many a backyard in Orleans, Eastham, and Wellfleet is butted by a swamp. There is even one swamp in Eastham the owners do not want the mosquitoes disturbed since there is tame turtles in the swamp and fish in the pond.

The real estate business is not like it used to be; today they "take em" and those that get "took" are pretty bashful about admitting it later. Occasionally one does put up a "For sale" sign soon after buying. But one would not look very important if he admitted being taken nowadays. And we got to look and act important. We have a development on Morris and Stage Island in Chatham (referred to in the park plan as Morris Island) in which 50 percent of the area below high ground is marsh and beach, which you or I could have staked out for ourselves not over 10 years ago, for only the costs of putting up four corners.

All beach and marshland in all the towns that was on the tax lists and taxes being paid on it is questionable—it was regarded as "wild land" and not worth paying taxes on. Taxes that was paid was negligible—and the question now is, no doubt in several instances, how can we be compensated for taxes by the Federal Park Service on land we did not collect taxes?

However, since the park idea got jellied there has been some odd things happening.

The history of the area, which can be best told by the Geodetic Survey maps over the years since they started, will show especially how the Monomoy Beach went, the inside marsh, or meadow went and then it was the ocean against the inner dunes or beach. The stories in the Massachusetts Historical Society volumes on how storms of the past, especially 1851, ate up 20-foot sand dunes in no time at all and had channels 15- to 20-feet deep running through the beach.

How at Chatham Light the land used to extend 5 miles to the southeast, that which is "fishing bottom" today was formerly beach and marshland and cedar swamps. It would not take much in a storm like the Portland Gale of 1898 to finish off a lot more of the beach. The hurricanes do not bother the outer beach as they do the southerly shores of the cape. It is a good fall or winter storm from the northeast that pounds hell out of it. How much longer will we have the beach? At Chatham it is the outer or Nauset Beach that is protecting the inside areas—when that breaks through, a new pattern of beach will be formed as it has always been done several times in the past. (See Geodetic maps over the years.)

We have selectman, named McNeece, who went into a great dither to make up a brochure on "Opposition to the Park," soliciting the chairman of all town committees and boards and individual officials to address a letter opposing the Park Service taking Morris Island and Monomoy Beach into the proposed seashore park area. When my brother-in-law, the chairman of the board of appeals said he was all for having the areas taken, he wanted no part of that in his brochure. So the only opinion in that brochure, made up at the citizens expense was a one-sided presentation for the opposition only.

The votes taken in Chatham's town meeting, was really a vote against the taking of Hardings Beach, a town-maintained beach, that is open to all the public now, was also not connected with the other park-proposed lands. Using that as a vote against everything when Hardings Beach has been dropped from the bill is foolish.

The town of Truro's zoning proponents used the park department's proposals as a lever to get zoning for the whole town, when we knew that the park department was only stipulating for proposed parkland areas only.

All we around here hear from the newly arrived residents is that we must stop the "riffraff" from coming down over the bridges. The people that have lived here all their lives and their children must knuckle down to making this a "residential area" for the "retired." This is supported by that secretary of Cape Cod Chamber of Commerce, Norman Cook, who also sponsored legislative action to get $35,000 more to add to the present fund of $50,000 yearly to "advertise" Cape Cod. On the other hand he appears before you and has to be negative to you in front of folks he has been acting positive with. He and his lot is the same crowd who are always telling that story about the family in a $5,000 to $10,000 home not paying enough taxes to send all his kids to school. Their knowledge of history is meager. Originally, in this State, it was the duty of the citizens thereof, to educate the children, but I do not have to tell anyone who has got to the Congress how much the citizens do in citizenship duties.

We hear about the "tax loss" if Morris Island is not allowed to be made into a private development. The man purchased it at a time he knew he was taking a gamble, he whined in town meeting how much his interest was costing him a year, but he should not have gone into it without being able to pay for it. The land itself was land courted, and then to gobble up more beach land he land courted the second. Land that was "open" land that any squatter could have established. Whatever taxes that development bring into Chatham will be spent double or more to furnish the usual services.

In the Chatham brochure you have knuckleheads wanting the Park Service to guarantee the waterways. More ignorants who don't know the difference between one government department and another and their scope of operations.

Each town should speak for itself, each landowner should speak for themselves, the secretary of the Cape Cod Chamber of Commerce and the Barnstable selectmen are not in the park area and should have stayed home and minded their own business. However, I would say, great consideration should be given to the landowners who have a well built up area, but these wild pines and swamps and land on water level are not prospective areas of excessive value.

Speaking for Chatham, I say take Morris Island and transfer Monomoy Beach Wildlife Refuge to the Park Service. However, I prefer the word "conservation" and proceeding along those lines, in preference to "recreation"—most of us for the park want the present status quo with the idea that folks can continue to do in those areas what they are already doing. I would go along with the closing of hunting in the whole area. Tenting or camping would have to be restricted or strictly supervised. A few roads could be developed for a scenic road route. Bridle paths in some areas could also be nice.

Your written testimony of the hearing is going to look foolish enough when read over, both sides goes to extremes in efforts to shout down each other, but we must have the park, I think you should give consent to a local advisory committee, but don't give them too much either.

Remember the Great Beach is disappearing, more and more each day, the best example of such being the area between Chatham Light and Monomoy Point in the last 40 years. All the cape outer beach will go the same way and some day the sea will be up against the inner highland, and the taxpayers will then be hollering for Federal expenditures for rip-rap to protect them, in their $20,000 homes they paid $40,000 for.

So as they say, "It is later than you think," enjoy it now, Thoreau's era is gone, never to come back, in all the swampland concerned its only the mosquitoes that will always be with us.

So let us get the ball rolling, vote for the Cape Cod Seashore Park including Morris Island and Monomoy Wildlife Refuge now.

Yours truly,

Francis A. T. Beane.

Eastover,
Lenox, Mass., December 12, 1960.

Congressman Wayne N. Aspinall,
Chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Care of Department of Natural Resources,
Boston, Mass.

Dear Congressman Aspinall: Relative to the epistle sent out by Mr. Donald B. Miller, of the Berkshire Eagle, on the proposal for a Cape Cod National Seashore Park, I have not heard anything more sensible in some time.

The burgeoning population of our country, coupled with suburbia and with the hideousness of the almost unbroken line of towns, cities, developments, billboards, bulldozers, town dumps, and the constant sewerage problem, makes it appear that you cannot act too soon.

At this stage of the game, I have a sincere envy of the American Indian before we came in to spoil his unblemished scenery, unpolluted waters, and abundance of fish and game and wildlife. It would appear to me that the white man, with all his progress, at the rate that we are going, will have nothing left to survey in our beautiful country.

I hope that no greedy, commercial-minded company or political party will do anything to block this fine proposal.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE J. BISACCA, *President.*

UNITED SHOE MACHINERY CORP.,
Boston, Mass., December 8, 1960.

Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: I should like to record myself as being strongly in favor of the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park covered by park bill S. 2636. I am very familiar with this area and feel that it is essential, particularly for future generations, that this natural area be preserved.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Prof. Serge Chermayeff at Harvard, who is authorized to present this statement at the hearings to be held at Eastham on December 16–17, 1960.

Sincerely yours,

W. S. BREWSTER.

TOWN OF BREWSTER,
Brewster, Mass., December 15, 1960.

Mr. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman of House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to go on record as opposed to the taking of land on Cape Cod for a national seashore park.

The expressed purposes for this taking such as bathing beaches, etc., are impractical.

The problem is the erosion of the outer Cape Cod beaches.

Until the following questions have been explained, such taking is not justified.

(1) What plans have been made to prevent or attempt to prevent this erosion.

(2) What areas are required to carry out these plans.

(3) Why these plans could not be carried out as efficiently if the areas were left under present control with Federal assistance.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE W. FOSTER,
FRED H. NASH,
LAWRENCE A. BAKER,
Selectmen of Brewster.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE,
Williamstown, Mass., December 13, 1960.

Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Care of Department of Natural Resources, Boston, Mass.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: I am much interested to know that there will be a hearing at Eastham Town Hall on December 16 and 17 in connection with the possible establishment of a national park at Cape Cod.

At this end of the State we are very much interested indeed in this proposal and deeply hope it may be carried through. In face of the enormous and cumulatively increasing need for recreational facilities, it is of the utmost importance that this magnificient site be reserved for public use before it is too late. Consequently, I shall be much indebted to you for any support you may be able to bring to the achievement of this proposal.

Cordially,

ROBERT R. R. BROOKS, *Dean.*

PITTSFIELD, MASS., *December 14, 1960.*

The Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Care of Department of Natural Resources, Boston, Mass.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: I wish to make known and record with you my interest in and support of the proposal for the establishment of a national park on Cape Cod, Mass.

While urgency in meeting the needs for parks and recreation is recognized by some of our governmental and civic bodies I believe it is particularly appropriate and significant to note that the President's Commission on National Goals in its recent report gives further weight to the argument that the Nation cannot put off its obligation to meet the needs for parks and recreation.

It is hoped you and your committee will take a step toward the solution of this problem by giving favorable consideration to the proposed Cape Code Park.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN BURBANK.

NEWTON, MASS., *December 15, 1960.*

Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Insular Affairs,
Eastham Town Hall, Eastham, Mass.

DEAR SIR: In view of the impending hearings on the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park bill, I would like to express my support for this measure.

I believe that the preservation of this area would be a farsighted act that would benefit not only our State but also the country as a whole.

Very truly yours,

STANLEY E. CHARM, Sc. D.

WARREN, R.I., *December 22, 1960.*

Representative GRACIE PFOST,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PFOST: I am writing to you in regard to the proposed Cape Cod National Park.

I am strongly in favor of this project for the following reasons:

1. We have no national park in the New England area.
2. The cape's beautiful New England charm is fast giving way to commercialism.
3. I feel that it is the Nation's obligation to preserve this for everyone to enjoy.

Since I am a property owner in Chatham, Mass., I would like to see this bill passed.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD F. CHELLEL, O.D.

TOWN OF CHATHAM PLANNING BOARD,
Chatham Mass., December 20, 1960.

MRS. GRACIE PFOST,
Chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. PFOST: Attached you will find a copy of a letter written by the Chatham Planning Board to Congressman Aspinall last June.

We respectfully request that this letter become a part of the record of the hearings which you graciously held in Eastham on December 16 and 17.

Very truly yours,

MRS. ALICE C. HISCOCK, *Clerk.*

TOWN OF CHATHAM PLANNING BOARD,
Chatham, Mass., June 15, 1960.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: All of the members of the Chatham Planning Board are in favor of the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park as per the revised Saltonstall-Kennedy-Keith bill. We strongly urge action at this session of the Congress.

We are in favor of all the land in Chatham on North Beach being included in the park; that the date of September 1, 1959, be retained as the deadline for building within the park areas, and further, that if Morris and Stage Islands are included within the park, that they will be used exclusively as a wildlife sanctuary in connection with Monomoy. We also recommend that there be no tenting, camping, or trailer parks allowed anywhere on Morris or Stage Islands.

Sincerely,

CHATHAM PLANNING BOARD,
E. MELSON WEBSTER.
GEORGE A. THORNTON.
ALICE C. HISCOCK.
CHARLES H. SHEPARD.
THOMAS ENNIS.

TOWN OF CHATHAM,
OFFICE OF THE SELECTMEN, ASSESSORS, AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
December 22, 1960.

MR. KARL S. LANDSTROM,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR KARL: In the records of the June 21, 1960, hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands was printed a copy of a letter written to Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall by Henry L. F. Kreger. The Chatham Board of Selectmen wrote Congressman Aspinall correcting certain inaccuracies in Mr. Kreger's letter and commenting on its content. No doubt this letter from Mr. Kreger will be made a part of the record of the congressional hearings and we would like our version included also. We are, therefore, enclosing a copy of our letter to Congressman Aspinall and would appreciate your including it in the record of the congressional hearings.

Also enclosed is a copy of a telegram received too late to be submitted at Eastham.

We would also like to call attention to certain errors in the statement of Mrs. Alice Hiscock, speaking as a member of the Chatham Planning Board. The causeway was built with State and town funds. No Federal funds could be used for building the dike.

It should also be made clear that Mrs. Hiscock spoke as an individual member of the planning board. The board, itself, is recorded in the brief prepared for the town and presented to the committee at the hearing in Washington in June.

Thank you again for visiting us under such trying weather conditions and our very best wishes for the coming year.

Very truly yours,

EVERETT C. SMALL,
DAVID F. RYDER,
ROBERT A. MCNEECE,
Selectmen.

APRIL 14, 1960.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have been handed a copy of a letter referring to S. 2636 addressed to you, on February 10th, by Mr. Henry L. F. Kreger of Cleveland, Ohio, which contains many factual errors and seems to rely heavily on an effort to raise doubts as to the integrity and motives of the selectmen of Chatham, so that you may in turn doubt the truth and validity of the statement they filed with the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands on behalf of the town of Chatham.

From the beginning to end Mr. Kreger's letter illustrates the risk a part-time resident assumes when he accepts unreliable, sketchy information as a basis for reaching conclusions on matters relating to his summer town. This lack of sound research is revealed in the opening sentence of his letter when he describes our statement as a "memorandum which purports to state the position of the town of Chatham." This statement, a copy of which is enclosed, expresses what is the position of the town of Chatham—a position which, in May 1959 was voted in relation to the original national seashore proposal by the Chatham Planning Board, the finance committee and the citizens themselves at a special town meeting. This position was again voted in relation to S. 2636 by the same board and committee and again by the voters at the annual town meeting of 1960. Copies of these town meeting votes are enclosed. If Mr. Kreger thinks that the selectmen of a little cape township would have the temerity to present a position on behalf of the town on such a vital matter without a mandate from the people he is totally unfamiliar with the relations between elected officials and citizens in these small communities.

In paragraph 2 Mr. Kreger may speak for himself but not for many year-round inhabitants as well as summer residents unless he identifies them and has their authorization. Actually, only four voters opposed the town's position at the last annual town meeting and all but one of the letters received by the selectmen from summer residents support the position taken by the town.

Paragraph 3 says, in effect, that the Chatham selectmen are so provincial that they have little or no knowledge of national parks, their real purpose in opposing the inclusion of Morris and Stage Islands is to help a few private interests to make a profit and that the islands will be just covered with cottages. Mr. Kreger's opinion of the motives of the selectmen "their real purpose, etc.", is disappointing to us but we are content to rely on the cogency of the facts our brief contains and the wisdom of the conclusions reached after careful study of these facts.

Nowhere in the statement do the selectmen even intimate that the areas within the park will be a "blight on the community." What they do say is that blight can and will occur in the area bordering the park because of the increased demand for lodging, meals, gasoline, souvenirs, novelties, and the like. No less an authority than the Director of the National Park Service, himself, admits this danger when he warns the residents of the lower cape towns to adopt adequate protective zoning. The fringe areas outside the park are the danger zones and if S. 2636 passes with the Morris-Monomoy area included Chatham will become a fringe area.

If the seashore is established 2½ million visiting days are predicted for the Cape within 4 years and 10 million within 15 years according to a study made under the direction of the National Park Service.

Mr. Kreger does not seem to comprehend that there is a very significant difference between a national park (forests) and a national seashore (beaches) and that this difference takes on added significance when one considers that the public beaches of a Cape Cod National Seashore will be within easy driving distance for millions of people. On a pleasant summer day Mr. Kreger should observe the stream of traffic out of Boston passing through the forests of the Blue Hills Reservation to get to the beach at Nantasket about 20 miles further distant. It is this kind and amount of down-for-the-day, or possibly weekend, traffic which makes the difference between an inland national park and a national seashore and it is this traffic which will be invited to swing around through Chatham to take a look at or use the Chatham branch of the national seashore.

After referring to his own summer place as a "residence," Mr. Kreger's statement that Morris Island will be cut up into a large number of cottage sites is rather amusing in view of the fact that the cheapest of these so-called cottage sites will sell for three times as much as Mr. Kreger paid in 1959 for similar land footage adjoining his own property and the lot size requirements in Mr. Kreger's zone are smaller than the lots laid out on Morris Island. Average size lots on Morris Island are slightly more than an acre and range in price from $11,000 to $27,000. Average size lots on Stage Island are about three-fourths of an acre and prices range from $8,300 to $16,700. Does this sound like the locale for a lot of little cottages? Very much to the contrary—the development plans for Morris Island are the finest ever submitted to the Chatham Planning Board and were exhibited at the Brussels World Fair in 1958 as an outstanding example of subdivision design.

Paragraph 4 is completely irrelevant. However, it was obviously written for the purpose of discrediting the selectmen of Chatham and for this reason we will present the true facts. Three selectmen serve the town of Chatham, the office of one expiring each year. The selectmen had no statutory right or power to build a town road across the causeway. Public roads can be built only by vote of the people. One former selectman, not the selectmen, is reputed to have made the statement referred to by Mr. Kreger. That selectman was out of office 2 years before the town voted unanimously on May 11, 1959, to build a road across the causeway. That selectman had no part in formulating the position of the town in relation to the national seashore.. To argue that because one selectman, on some prior occasion made a misleading statement the words and actions of all succeeding selectmen are suspect suggests a degree of cynicism which does not become Mr. Kreger.

Paragraph 5 implies that our reference to the marsh preservation program in connection with Morris Island was pure bait. Actually the town had in its possession written commitments from both owners of the islands but it could not accept land for purely conservation purposes until authorized to do so by the Massachusetts Legislature. This authorization was obtained through acceptance at the last annual town meeting of a statutory requirement that the town set up a conservation commission. Our town counsel and the chairman of our conservation commission are now drawing up the documents which will insure the preservation of the cedar swamp, the marshes and sections of the low beach areas of Morris and Stage Islands. A copy of the State legislative act which resulted from our efforts is enclosed.

In paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 Mr. Kreger is entitled to whatever impressions he may have drawn from the brief. The facts were true and accurate at the time the brief was written. During the storms of the past winter the span of water was four times as wide as the 300 feet stated in our brief. The enclosed photograph will indicate the extent of the span. Local commercial fisherman and party boat operators, who have a greater knowledge of the subject than Mr. Kreger, agree that this site for a potential alternate channel should be reserved by the town. As of the date of this letter there continues to be a much wider span of water at high tide. Our brief stressed the fact that this whole region is unpredictable, the points being that the National Park Service could not, from one year to another, assure access to Monomoy by overland route.

Contrary to Mr. Kreger's statement, the agent for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, who controls the only bulldozer in the vicinity, testifies that no bulldozing has been done on the site. Again, contrary to Mr. Kreger the largest breach of the last half century is the one under discussion and not the former one between Morris Island and the mainland. As to the probability of the dike withstanding future hurricanes, the U.S. Army Engineers studied the tides resulting from all of the hurricanes Mr. Kreger has lived through and designed the dike to be well above any of them.

In paragraph 9 Mr. Kreger neglects to inform you that tenting is one of the uses planned for Morris Island by the National Park Service. There is room on the islands for many more tentsites than the planned residence sites. Mr. Kreger ventures the opinion that the islands are so small that their probable attraction to visitors will create about the same amount of traffic as that serving 74 private dwellings on the islands. However, in a later paragraph he describes Nauset and the islands as the region's best showpieces. Now, if he would have these islands preserved because they are the region's best showpieces, and if he would invite all America through the free publicity given to national parks, to come to see and use these best showpieces and still attract so few campers, fishermen, picnickers and sightseers that their total traffic would just about equal that of the occupants of 74 private dwellings, then there must be something wrong with the picture he draws. Either the islands will have so little appeal to the American public that the cost of their acquisition, administration, and maintainance will not be justified, or Mr. Kreger has underestimated their attraction and the stream of beach buggies, sightseeing buses, camp-equipped stationwagons and private cars will certainly create substantially more traffic through Chatham than he anticipates.

It is understandable that Mr. Kreger would prefer to be able to continue to look over at Morris and Stage Islands from his windows and enjoy them in their natural state. However, even if the National Park Service assumes control of the islands, space must be cleared for tentsites, trails, and parking, and buildings must be erected for a reception center, equipment storage, and toilet facilities, so some change in his view is inevitable. Furthermore, once the National Park Service does take over, neither Mr. Kreger nor any of us can be sure of the kind or extent of the recreational activities which may be permitted on the islands.

In paragraph 10 it was not intended to imply that the $50,000 annual loss in tax revenue represented a net loss. However, developments of this quality do provide a higher-than-average net gain to the town. The town has an easement for only one road over one island. It provides no utilities. The residences will be occupied by summer people and to anticipate that any of them will winter over in this remote area, sending their children to the local schools, is too imaginative to be creditable. As to the rest of this paragraph and the others which follow, we will sum up as briefly as possible.

Chatham is a fine residential community and its economy depends on its maintaining a fine residential character. Mr. Kreger concerns himself with preserving a small area of the town. The selectmen and the townspeople are concerned with preserving the character of the town as a whole. By inviting untold numbers of tourists and sightseers through our town to see the little area Mr. Kreger would preserve, serious injury will be caused to the balance of the town. The logical consequence of the national seashore will be increased tourist traffic which in turn will cause a demand for more land to be used for motels, restaurants, lunch and souvenir stands, filling stations, and other such stores and services common to tourist trade. This is a widely accepted prediction confirmed very recently in the report of the economic study made under the direction of the National Park Service. As selectmen we are constantly aware of the pressure to shift over from residential to commercial land use. As a part-time resident Mr. Kreger obviously is not.

Our efforts have been directed toward shielding Chatham from overcommercialism so that one typical lower cape town might be preserved in a relatively unspoiled condition. We believe that the accomplishment of our plans will contribute more to posterity than would be the case if Morris and Stage Islands were preserved and the fine character of the balance of the town seriously injured if not destroyed.

We believe this to be the broad view as well as the long view because the scope is greater in area and the beneficiaries greater in numbers.

Very truly yours,

Everett C. Small,
Robert A. McNeece,
David F. Ryder,
Selectmen, Town of Chatham.

Providence, R.I., *December 16, 1960.*

Robert McNeece,
Selectman, Chatham, Mass.

I am vitally interested in the national seashore park hearings now in progress as I own a cottage within its proposed boundaries. I had planned to attend but cannot be there. While I am in favor of the purpose of the park, would you kindly register my opposition to the following aspects of the proposed legislation:

(1) There should be a balance of ownership on oceanfront property. Neither Federal, municipal or private interests should exclusively control all the oceanfront property.

(2) The September 1959 construction clause is not only inequitable but unjust. The present bill is only a proposal and should not be retroactive.

(3) If it would be helpful to the town of Chatham, I would be willing to grant a scenic or conservation easement to my property.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Peter Hallock,
Touisset, Mass.

Park Department,
Chatham, Mass., December 21, 1960.

Subject: Cape Cod National Seashore.

Hon. Gracie Pfost,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Pfost: The Park Commissioners of the Town of Chatham, unfortunately, were unable to attend the congressional committee hearings in Eastham on December 16 and 17 because of illness and jury duty. The park commission has not been consulted by the selectmen of Chatham or any other official body regarding this subject. We wish, however, to record our unanimous opinion as follows:

(1) We are in favor of the Cape Cod National Seashore, generally, as outlined in the Saltonstall-Kennedy bill (S. 2636).

(2) We strongly favor the inclusion of Morris Island and Stage Island (Chatham) in this national seashore. These two areas, really one island, are an integral part of Monomoy from the standpoint of conservation and wildlife preservation.

(3) We feel that Morris Island, State Island, and Monomoy should be kept in their natural state and that campsites, roads, or other development should be kept to a minimum.

(4) We disagree with the selectmen's statement of the position of the town of Chatham in relation to Senate bill S. 2636, presented to the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Senate Interior Committee dated December 9, 1959, as it relates to Morris Island and the effect on the general character and economy of Chatham if this area is included in the national seashore. The selectmen do not approve the inclusion of Morris Island in the national seashore.

(5) We hope that S. 2636 or a similar bill will be acted on favorably by the 87th Congress at the earliest possible time.

We will be glad to amplify paragraph 4 above if it is so desired.

Respectfully yours,

CHESTER I. HACKETT,
ARTHUR H. ALEXANDER,
SAMUEL H. COBB,
Park Commissioners.

WARE, MASS., *December 12, 1960.*

HON. WAYNE ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Eastham Town Hall, Eastham, Mass.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: As residents of Massachusetts who have long been in favor not only of preserving inviolate the present national parks, monuments, and other areas but also of adding new wilderness and seashore for the benefit of all Americans, we earnestly urge your cooperation at the hearings to be held at Eastham on December 16 and 17. We feel very strongly that the proposed exclusion from Cape Cod National Seashore Park of sections of Eastham, Wellfleet, and Truro, in addition to those already considered, would render the park much less important to all concerned. Surely the concessions already made to those who would exploit the area for personal gain are amply sufficient.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN H. CONKEY,
DOROTHY D. CONKEY.

LEE LIME CORP.,
Lee, Mass., December 13, 1960.

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
Boston, Mass.

(Attention of Congressman Wayne N. Aspinall, Chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want to be recorded, both personally and for our corporation, in favor of the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park. Sentiment in this park is widespread not only as it affects the people who live on the cape but as it affects the potential development of the entire Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the preservation of an area of natural and historic interest which would provide public outdoor recreational activities for Massachusetts citizens as well as others obviously from other sections of the country. The vacation-travel agency is the most important one in the State.

The proposal has sound and broad favorable recommendation not only from the citizenry of the State but also from the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as well as supported by enabling legislation filed in the Congress by Senators Kennedy and Saltonstall and other Members of the congressional delegation. We hope, therefore, that you will support the recommendation of the Department of Interior as we feel it is proper recommendation.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN M. DEELY, *Chairman of the Board.*

VILLAGE OF PARK FOREST,
Park Forest, Ill., December 22, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am writing in support of the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore. I would like my letter to be made a part of the record of the hearings your committee is conducting.

For many years, my family and I have driven 2,500 miles each summer in order to spend a few weeks at Wellfleet on Cape Cod. We know the area very well. We obviously have a high regard for it or we would not travel such a great distance. We hope to continue to spend as much time as we can on the cape.

As the years have passed, we have been struck, and concerned, by the way the remaining "open" areas of the cape have been covered by undesirable developments. As the new, limited-access highways have been completed, the "lower cape" has become more accessible. The result has been disappearance of beaches and land open to the public, appearance of countless commercial establishments, and a great increase in litter, even vandalism. When young people can drive from Boston to Orleans just to spend an evening on the beach, is it any wonder that the beach should be littered with beer cans and paper the next morning? And this has been the actual experience.

As a public official, I recognize and appreciate the problems of the communities on the cape. I sympathize with their desire to maintain local control. But, as one who governs a community of 30,000, I can also recognize how impossible it is for the local officials on the cape to save their beautiful land. Their legal authority is weak, especially with the great reluctance of the residents to grant adequate zoning and subdivision powers to the municipalities. Their financial resources are very limited; they could spend their entire budgets just trying to keep up with the litter and vandalism, as they watch the countryside disappear under the cover of cottages and refreshment stands.

As one who believes that Cape Cod is a precious natural resource, belonging to all the people of the United States, I urge you and your committee to approve a national seashore on Cape Cod. This would be an act that would be appreciated and saluted by our children and generations thereafter.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT A. DINERSTEIN, *Village President.*

LAW OFFICES, WARD & SIMMONS,
Washington, D.C., December 13, 1960.

Re Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Town Hall, Eastham, Mass.

GENTLEMEN: Our client, Howard A. Dodge, the owner of 18 acres, plus or minus, in the Wellfleet area, desires to state his position to the committee with respect to the hearings to be held on December 16 and 17, 1960.

LOCATION OF OUR CLIENT'S LAND

Our client's land is located in the Wellfleet area generally between the Chequesset Country Club and the Herring River and is identified roughly by an outline shown on the attached portion of a map showing a geological survey of the Wellfleet quadrangle which is attached hereto and marked "Howard A.

Dodge Exhibit 'A'." Also attached hereto is a sketched survey showing this tract of land as prepared by Arthur L. Sparrow Co., civil engineers, South Orleans, Mass., marked "Howard A. Dodge Exhibit 'B'."

VALUE OF THIS LAND

Our client's land is very valuable for potential use in the production of cranberries and one section of this land has traditionally been known as "Cranberry Hill"; it also is valuable for the production of blueberries and another section of this land has traditionally been known as "Blueberry Valley"; the third value factor is the high quality of topsoil which is available in very large quantities because of its depth in addition to its quality as a loamy topsoil and sales have been made at $8 per square yard on the site. These factors are called to your attention because it would appear that the appropriation requested in the bill will create financial restrictions; hence, value factors demand substantial preliminary consideration.

VAGUENESS OF THE BILL

The bill is very vaguely worded; hence, our client is unable to ascertain at this point whether any of his land is within the taking area. The boundary line description so far in the bill (S. 2636, p. 5) which affects our client's land reads as follows:

> "thence leaving Wellfleet Harbor and running three-tenths of a mile northwesterly to the top of a ridge between Herring River and the Chequesset Country Club *as depicted on the said Wellfleet quadrangle sheet*;
>
> "thence northeasterly along the said ridge continuing across Mill Creek on a straight line following in general a ridge and crossing the right-of-way of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad to a point two-tenths of a mile northeasterly thereof;"

It is very confusing as to which ridge is referred to in the bill, because there are several ridges that could be contemplated. Our preliminary information is to the effect that the highest elevation is anticipated, running from said ridge to and beyond the railroad so as to give a panoramic view from said highest elevation looking across toward Cape Cod Bay.

If that is the intent of this proposed legislation, then the boundary line would only involve the northwesterly portion of our client's tract and to a very limited degree. If only that portion; namely, a slight northwesterly portion of our client's land would be involved for the park area, our client has expressed a willingness to donate such a portion of his land for the park area. On the attached exhibit "A" is shown a line which would embrace a slight northwesterly portion of our client's land and would still be in keeping with the intent of this legislation for said park area. We have attempted to obtain the intent of this legislation so far as the involvement of our client's land is concerned. On a map in the Department of the Interior National Park Service a line is projected that would intersect our client's land; the same would be true of a map which we saw in the office of this committee. On the map which we saw in Senator Kennedy's office, a lesser portion of the northwesterly section of our client's land would be involved in the taking area. In discussions pertaining to this boundary line, all parties concerned were vague as to the actual taking area, hence we are confronted with a dilemma.

As stated earlier herein, if the intent of this bill is to have the line at the highest elevation, then the proposals herein are submitted for your consideration in the hope that our client's land is not involved within the taking area and if only a slight portion of the northwesterly portion of his land is within the taking area, then our client would entertain negotiations looking toward a donation of such a small portion for park purposes.

CONCLUSIONS

We urge the committee to consider the representations made herein with the hope that only a small northwesterly portion of our client's land will be involved in the taking area and assure the committee of our desire to cooperate fully as indicated by our client's willingness to donate a part of his land which he feels to be in keeping with the intent behind this legislation. On the other hand, if a substantial portion or all of our client's land is involved, then he will have no alternative but to press for the highest market value of his land. The committee should also consider the land belonging to the Chequesset Country Club which would be involved in condemnation proceedings if the boundary line is accepted which intersects our client's land, as there again very substantial condemnation costs would be indicated.

Respectfully submitted.

J. BENJAMIN SIMMONS,
Attorney for Howard A. Dodge.

DOWNES LUMBER CO.,
Boston, Mass., December 8, 1960.

Subject: Park bill S. 2636.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We wish to be recorded in favor of the above park bill, and hope that it will soon be enacted into law.

We believe that this will greatly enhance the recreational pleasure of people visiting the cape from all over the United States, particularly those from the Boston and eastern Massachusetts areas.

We also feel that by conserving this area, the people of the cape will be greatly benefited in health and welfare.

We most earnestly hope that you and your committee will act favorably on this bill.

Sincerely yours,

DOWNES LUMBER CO.,
By J. EDWARD DOWNES, Jr.,
Treasurer.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *December 15, 1960.*

The purpose of this statement is to urge that the bill (S. 2636), which provides for the establishment of a Cape Cod National Seashore Park, be reported favorably by the committee and be translated into law at the next session of Congress.

I make this statement as a private citizen, a resident of Massachusetts, and as one who has enjoyed the Cape Cod seashore for many years. I make this statement because I wish to join others who are concerned about the preservation and the conservation of a large segment of lower Cape Cod.

Why do I think that the lower cape area should be permanently preserved as a national seashore park? Basically, the park can preserve approximately 30,000 acres and miles of seashore abounding in wildlife, and serve as a classroom and laboratory for science and nature study, a much needed recreation area for our expanding population, and as a caretaker of the historical heritage of Cape Cod. All of these reasons are well stated in the bill which reads, in part, as follows:

"Whereas the coastal and shoreline area on Cape Cod, Massachusetts, possesses unique cultural, scenic, historic, scientific, and recreational values; and

"Whereas these values are an important and irreplaceable part of the heritage of the United States; and

"Whereas these values should be preserved and enhanced for the benefit and inspiration of all of the people and of the United States of present and future generations; and

"Whereas an adequate and representative portion of Cape Cod should be set aside and developed to assure its unimpaired use and enjoyment for varied cultural, scenic, historic, scientific, and recreational purposes."

I feel that the above objectives can best be realized by bringing part of Cape Cod into the national park system.

At this time, I think that there are valid reasons to be concerned about our present and future way of life and the adequacy of important public facilities. In this respect, both on a local and a national level, there is an acute shortage of public seashore areas. For this reason, there was some consolation when in 1959 the Park Service recommended the establishment of a national seashore park in Cape Cod and Senators Kennedy and Saltonstall introduced bill S. 2636. However, it was a great disappointment to many when Congress did not take any decisive action on the park bill during the 1960 session. Furthermore, during this delay, there is evidence of commercial and developmental encroachments inside the proposed park area which are destroying acres of natural beauty.

At this point, it may be pertinent to recall that only a relatively few years ago, the National Park Service called attention to our vanishing shoreline and recommended that 12 seashore areas embracing over 400 miles of ocean front be preserved as national parks. Unfortunately, only one, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, was set aside for the people. Almost all of the other areas have long since gone into private and commercial developments. I trust that this will not be the fate of the lower Cape Cod area.

In the summer of 1960, I visited the magnificent Cape Hatteras Seashore Park. As I left, my departing thought was, "If we only had more areas like this." Therefore, I feel strongly about the opportunity offered by the cape area. From my limited efforts in attempting to obtain public support for the cape park, I am sure that almost all of the people of the State want the Cape Cod Park to be established. In fact, the two leading Boston papers, the Boston Globe and the Boston Herald, also favor the establishment of a cape park.

I am aware of the fact that there is some local opposition to the establishment of the park. Certainly, we all realize that our country cannot successfully progress toward a better life for our increasing and largely urbanized population unless people are willing to subordinate private interest or the interests of a few to the majority and to the national interest. While I am no expert, in my opinion, S. 2636 is a liberal bill as far as protecting the interests of the people and the six Cape Cod towns affected by the proposed park. To Cape Codders, the park may well provide expanded opportunities to serve the Nation by sharing their beautiful area with countless Americans. To the Nation, the cape park can contribute to the education, enjoyment, and mental and physical strengthening of present and future generations.

May I again respectfully urge this committee to act swiftly and favorably on the Cape Cod National Seashore legislation.

HENRY A. DYMSZA, Ph. D.,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *December 9, 1960.*

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: Since I am unable to attend the hearing on the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park, which your committee has announced for Eastham on December 16–17, 1960, I am submitting the following statement, which I hope may be helpful. I respectfully request that it be entered as part of the record of the hearing.

To qualify myself as knowing something about the problems involved in the proposal for the Cape Cod National Seashore Park, I should start, perhaps, by identifying myself as a landscape architect (fellow, American Society of Landscape Architects) and planning consultant (member, American Institute of Planners) and currently professor of city and regional planning at the Harvard Graduate School of Design. During the 37 years of my professional career, I have worked on many park problems in National, State, and local parks, and have served on the boards directing the affairs of the Massachusetts Trustees of Reservations, the National Parks Association, and the American Planning and Civic Association. I have also been planning consultant to many cities and towns for the preparation of master plans and zoning and subdivision regulations to guide the development of communities with a great variety of problems.

As one who knows the special quality of lower Cape Cod and the pressing need for immediate action, if the outer beach, the Kettle Hole ponds, and the flavor of the cape towns are to be preserved for enjoyment by future generations, I wish to be recorded as urging favorable and early action by your committee and by the Congress on this legislation. Delay imposes great hardships on innocent people and jeopardizes the full fruition of our hopes. Change is inevitable and is taking place rapidly on the lower cape in public and private efforts to forestall the effects of the park, to kill it, or to "make a killing" out of real estate both in or near the park. Even those most in favor of the park cannot prevent changes due to illness, death, and changed personal circumstance.

It is patently unfair to put a cloud on a man's property and then do nothing. It is equally unfair to the general public and to the Nation's taxpayers to allow destruction of park values or speculative increases in values through failure to act promptly.

The proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park has been adequately studied and reported on to establish:

1. The importance to the Nation of preserving this unusual section of ocean frontage—one of the few remaining stretches of relatively unspoiled natural seashore;

2. The unique qualities of the lower cape, in the geology, ecology, natural history, and scenery of the area, combined with its historic significance and the special flavor of the villages and so-called cape way of life;

3. The purposes of the National Park Service, if the park is established—

   (*a*) to preserve the scenic, scientific, and historic features by preventing overuse and by concentration of visitors at a limited number of areas;

   (*b*) to exclude concessions, which would compete with private enterprises outside the park, for lodgings, restaurants, and related services; and

   (*c*) to work with the towns, State, and Federal agencies on problems of the local communities and for conversion of Route 6 to a limited access highway with "no more than one or two park access points provided from it within each town." (Letters of Secretary of the Interior to Senators Kennedy and Saltonstall, March 31, 1960.)

4. The general agreement by the citizens of the area that the park should be established, in spite of the noisy opposition of some town officials (some of whom seem to be voicing their private interests when appearing as public officials).

The opposition to the proposed park is still trying to reduce the park area and to reinstate the iniquitous provisions from an earlier form of the bill for a 10-percent elimination of properties from the park.

The boundaries for the park (as described in sec. 1 of the committee print, June 11, 1960, S. 2636, 86th Cong., 2d sess.) are the absolute minimum to preserve the features which it is hoped to include in the park. In my testimony before the Senate subcommittee a year ago, I urged inclusion of Morris Island in Chatham. Since then further studies have shown the desirability of adding sufficient area in South Wellfleet to control the views westerly from Route 6 across the marsh at Blackfish Brook and down the bay to Wellfleet Harbor.

In some places on the fringe of the proposed park, the Secretary of the Interior may find that acquisition of the full fee-simple title may not be necessary and that the property can be left in private control subject to restrictions and easements held by the Federal Government. Outside the proposed boundaries similar easements and restrictions should be acquired—to supplement and support zoning regulations—along the shores facing the park on Nauset Harbor and Pleasant Bay for protection of views from the park toward those areas, and generally within a distance of 1,000 feet outside the park boundary.

Rights in land and easements or restrictions cannot only back up the zoning in critical cases, but also may prove more economical than outright acquisition of property. As shown in the technical bulletin No. 36 of the Urban Land Institute on "Conservation Easements," precedents are available in the authority of the Boston Metropolitan Park Commission (1894) and of the National Capital Planning Commission (Public 646, acts of 1928) to acquire rights in land on properties adjoining or in view from public parks. The National Park Service and the California State Park Agency have acquired scenic easements under similar authority and the States of California and New York have authorized acquisition of conservation easements for the preservation of open spaces. The kind of easement or restriction which is appropriate will vary with different properties, but can include everything covered by zoning regulations and a variety of special provisions beyond the usual zoning authority as well (such as prohibition of tree cutting, against drainage or fill of swamps and ponds, requirements to control drifting sand, or control over external appearance of buildings).

I would suggest an amendment to section 2 of the bill to give the Secretary authority to acquire and condemn rights in land for the protection of the park within 1,000 feet of the external limits described in section 1 or along shores of bays, rivers, and ponds facing the park, and to include a very broad interpretation of "rights in land" so as to cover a great variety of situations. In view of the inadequacies of zoning protection I would further suggest that this power to condemn rights in land over properties adjoining the park should not be suspended in section 4, but rather be specifically exempted from the provisions of that section.

The needs of the towns should be given every consideration, not by eliminating property from the park but by substantial assistance in making the best use of the lands outside the park through a vigorous program of positive planning and zoning.

Zoning and planning: Section 4(b)(2) would suspend the Secretary's authority to condemn improved property in any town for as long as a zoning bylaw approved by him is in force and applicable to such property. Further requirements as to zoning are spelled out in section 5.

While applauding the purpose of those who introduced the bill to encourage the towns to make plans and adopt zoning bylaws, the provisions in these sections are, I fear, inadequate for protection of the park, to promote the larger objective of guiding the growth and changes in the towns, and particularly to produce a healthy and harmonious relationship between those communities and the park.

Perhaps there is some confusion here, as is frequently the case, between planning and zoning, and a mistaken assumption that zoning is planning. Zoning is only one of several tools to implement a town plan, and should follow rather than precede the adoption of a master plan or comprehensive plan for the community.

The first need is for a regional plan for the combined area of the six lower cape towns, to provide a basic framework and the policies governing the relationships between the towns and the park. I would respectfully suggest that the park bill include provisions for the National Park Service to provide matching funds, and perhaps the services of planning consultants, under appropriate conditions, to a regional planning agency for the preparation of such a regional plan. Then, in the context of that regional plan, the towns could obtain assistance on their local planning problems through the usual procedures of the HHFA 701 projects. Because of the special Federal interest with the relation of these towns to the national seashore park, additional assistance would be warranted.

Last year I called attention to some of the difficulties which could be foreseen due to the language in the earlier form of S. 2636 concerning zoning. In the committee print of June 11, 1960, revisions have covered some of the points then raised, but uncertainty still remains as to whether the zoning required to suspend the Secretary's authority to condemn applies to the whole of each town or only to all property within the boundaries of the park or the area comprising the park as provided in section 5 b and c. At the hearing a year ago, Senator Saltonstall stated that it was his intention that zoning and zoning standards should apply to the whole town. I am not a lawyer, but I find the wording of the bill very far from clear on this point.

Also, perhaps again due to my lack of training as a lawyer, the new provisions concerning the effect of a variance on the Secretary's authority to condemn are very difficult to understand. I suppose it means that the granting of any variance or exception which the Secretary finds does not conform with the standards automatically restores the Secretary's power of condemnation, so as to forestall action by the owner under the variance. But if that is the meaning, the power of condemnation is not enough to prevent damage to the park through zoning violations and zoning changes or variances. Time and money must be available to exercise that power. In subsection (d) of section 5, the Secretary's authority might well extend to cover an injunction against improvements or changes in use contrary to the approved zoning.

In summary, I would stress:

1. No further cutting back the size of the proposed park;
2. Addition of Morris Island and South Wellfleet Inlet;
3. Additional powers, for acquisition of rights in land, conservation or scenic easements and restrictions both inside and within 1,000 feet outside the park boundaries, and no suspension of condemnation of such easements;
4. Assistance for regional planning of the lower cape;
5. Clarification of the provisions concerning zoning—in the area to which applicable, and concerning variances or exceptions; and
6. Power to enjoin private actions under variances or violations of zoning.

Most important, however, is the urgent need for early action to authorize the Cape Cod National Seashore Park. Time is running out.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES W. ELIOT.

THE PAUL REVERE LIFE INSURANCE CO.
Worcester, Mass., December 15, 1960.

Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am the owner of a main residence in Worcester, Mass., and a summer residence on Cape Cod on the shore of Nantucket Sound in the area of West Hyannis Port about 2 miles west of the Kennedy residence. If this gives me a vote on the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park at your hearing in Eastham on December 16, please record me as in favor of the national park and against any private or local interest opposition.

It is most important to conserve the natural resources of the cape; in fact, for many years I have tried to help protect the zoning laws in our area against requests for variances to appeals boards by commercial interests.

I appreciate that public hearings are necessary, but I do hope yours will not be weighed too heavily on any popularity contest basis as to whether the opponents or proponents are successful in getting the most persons to appear personally.

I understand that in a short period of geologic time, about 500,000 or 1 million years or so, the outer cape will all be under water. In the meantime, let's make it a national park.

Very truly yours,

WARREN A. ELLSWORTH, *Comptroller.*

EMMANUEL COLLEGE,
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY,
Boston, Mass., December 12, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior or Insular Affairs,
Eastham Town Hall:

The members of the biology department and faculty should like to be recorded as in great favor of a Cape Cod National Seashore Park which would serve as a wildlife sanctuary, a classroom, and a laboratory for science and nature study, and a much needed recreation area. We feel that such worthy aims should be supported and encouraged and that the northeastern area of our country should have the same outstanding national conservation areas as in the south and west. We feel the natural beauty of the eastern seaboard area should be conserved in some small area for present and future appreciation and study. The proposed Cape Cod National Park presents an attractive site for such a project. We feel an east coast national park is a wise conservation measure for the preservation of the total picture of America's natural beauty and wildlife areas, which should be spared the inroads and commercialization of unappreciative and unthinking private interests.

SISTER MARGARET, *Chairman,*
SISTER MARY FRANCES, S.N.D.,
ELAINE M. CORBETT,
DOROTHY T. RICE,
SISTER MARY ST. JOHN, S.N.D.,
SISTER BENEDICTA MARIE, S.N.D.,
Biology Faculty.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF AMHERST, MASS.,
December 7, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior or Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As one of thousands of American citizens interested in conservation and improved health and welfare of our people through expanded opportunities for outdoor living and recreation, may I encourage you and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to support wholeheartedly the proposed park bill (S. 2636), which President-elect Kennedy, Senator Saltonstall, the National Park Services and, I am sure, thousands of American citizens, including many of us who live here in New England, are likewise supporting. I refer, of course, to support for the establishment of the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

Last April, Mrs. Goodrich, our three school-age children, and I had the opportunity of visiting and camping at the beautiful Cape Hatteras Recreation Area (the Outer Banks) off North Carolina. I believe you are aware of the background involving the long struggle which resulted in the establishment of the Cape Hatteras Recreational Area and I believe you will concur that such establishment came barely in time—indeed, in some instances there is evidence that Cape Hatteras came belatedly and restoration is not only slow but expensive.

With this in mind, I shudder to think of the future of my own Cape Cod unless the Cape Cod National Seashore Park is translated into reality, and it may very well be that our efforts may be somewhat tardy. Much of Cape Cod is a classic example of unrestrained private enterprise determined to furnish a hungry American with a larger and longer hotdog or a thirsty American with greater opportunities to drink more beer. It is evident that the neon light people have had a field day on the cape, and I regret that the end is not yet in sight.

If the Pilgrims were to land on the cape today, I am confident that they would return to the Mayflower posthaste and head, as they intended, for the beautiful shores of Virginia or the Outer Banks.

I realize that there is tremendous opposition to this proposed park but I believe I know a little about New Englanders and I assure you that we, in New England, are more concerned basically with the future of this little section of these United States than we are with the monetary gain of private interest.

Unfortunately, I cannot be present at the public hearings on the Cape Cod legislation, scheduled to be held at the Eastham Town Hall on December 16 and 17 but, if I could be there I would certainly speak out in favor of the proposed legislation.

Would you be willing to do this for me?

Very truly yours,

RALPH W. GOODRICH,
Superintendent of Schools.

TOUISSET, MASS., *December 18, 1960.*

HON. GRACIE PFOST,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM: I am vitally interested in S. 2636 and in the Cape Cod National Seashore Park congressional subcommittee hearings you are now conducting. As I own property within the boundaries of the proposed park, I had hoped to be able to attend these hearings to express my views to you in person.

Because of bad health, I am unable to be there to register my opposition to certain aspects of the proposed legislation, hence I am writing you this letter.

(1) There should be a balanced ownership of ocean-front property. Neither Federal, State, municipal, nor private interests should exclusively control all of the ocean-front property. If the bill is passed in its present form, it will place in the hands of the Federal Government every foot of Atlantic ocean-front property on the cape.

(2) The September 1959 construction clause of the bill is unjust. It is a discriminatory prevention measure which should not be included as part of the bill. Such a retroactive clause is not only unjust but inequitable.

Those of us who own property on Cape Cod are in favor of the purpose of the bill, but are opposed to the extensive amount of waterfront property being taken and also the unjust 1959 September construction clause. Please do not allow this legislation to be pushed through in its present form.

Respectfully yours,

PETER HALLOCK.

WALTHAM, MASS, *December 12, 1960.*

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the proposed national seashore park at Cape Cod, I for one wish to go very much on record as wholeheartedly in favor of the park.

It seems to me as one small individual that something must be done on our northern east coast to preserve for the American people a great natural beach, such as the wonderful Cape Hatteras Park to the south.

At the tremendous rate our natural seashore is being depleted by the insidious encroachment of commercialism, i.e., hotdog stands, motels, beer joints, shack settlements and other general debasement by profit-hungry individuals, there will be very little left for the children of America to see of the heritage nature has left them of unspoiled natural seashore of one of our last great outer beaches.

It seems to me everyone should be interested in doing all they can to promote a park of this sort where one may wander for miles on beautiful unspoiled beaches and rolling sand dunes enjoying nature in her fullest. What a wonderful thing to be able to hand down to future generations.

Hopefully yours,

RICHARD P. HARDING.

CHATHAM, MASS.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: We have read with great interest the published record of the hearings on the bill to establish a Cape Cod National Seashore Park (86th Cong., S. 2636), especially the portion which relates to the Chatham area. Such objections as were made by the Chatham citizens and nonresident property owners relate chiefly to one matter: the inclusion of Morris and Stage Islands in the park.

There appears to be no real objection to the continuation of Monomoy as a wildlife refuge. The evidence is overwhelming that this desolate and beautiful peninsula (or island as it becomes from time to time) is one of the most important east coast flight-staging areas for migratory fowl, both of the game-bird and song-bird varieties. The hearings developed no real desire to change its status.

Similarly, the inclusion of Nauset Beach in the park has not been opposed by the Chatham authorities or residents. The only reservations about the beach related to the protection of rights of navigation and the maintenance of access to Pleasant Bay and to Stage Harbor. (Hearings, pp. 43, 49, 56.)

Objections to including Morris and Stage Islands in the park quite naturally came from the owners of these islands and those who hoped for immediate profits from their proposed exploitation as a real estate development. (Hearings, pp. 42, 97, 184, 237.)

To our minds the really serious objections to making these islands part of the park stem from the fear that they are to be made into "campsites" similar to those established in the national parks of the West and other remote areas. If this occurs, we also are convinced that the statements as to the unfavorable results to the Chatham area are well founded. The character of these islands makes them a natural supplement to Monomoy as a wildlife refuge. (Hearings, pp 204–206.) Camping sites in this location would be diametrically opposed to maintenance of the status of Monomoy and would ultimately destroy its character.

We share the sentiments of those who are disturbed at the steadily growing hordes who descend on the cape region each summer. However, we feel that, in fairness, this must be ascribed not to the proposed establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore but to the activities of the cape's many chambers of commerce and to the resort operators, who for years have conducted successful (but, we believe, misguided) advertising campaigns designed to bring about this very result.

If the pending bill can be amended to include appropriate restrictions on the use of Morris and Stage Islands which will maintain their present character and, in effect, supplement the Monomoy wildlife sanctuary, we believe this will satisfy the principal objections and best serve the long-term interests of Chatham.

KATHARINE A. HEBERTON.
ROBT. H. HEBERTON.
LENA L. CARTWRIGHT.
CHARLES W. CARTWRIGHT.
JAMES M. CUTHBERTSON.
CONSTANCE S. CUTHBERTSON.
MARY A. BIGELOW.
EDWARD A. BIGELOW.

CHATHAM, MASS.

Mr. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am one of the citizens of Chatham who was for the park, including the taking of Morris Island and the transfer of the Monomoy Beach Wildlife Refuge to the park department.

However, I, and others with the same thoughts as I, were denied the privilege, of having them printed in the Chatham Brochure, since the selectman getting it up at town expense was only interested in material in opposition. Therefore, the only official report you got was the "opposition report."

The vote in town meeting against the park was directed against the taking of Hardings Beach, which item has been deleted from the proposals, and should not be counted against the remainder. The vote was not divided on Hardings Beach, Morris Island, and Monomoy Beach. It was all one, with the opposition mainly against the Hardings Beach angle.

The man who is trying the development of Morris Island knew the chances he took at the time he bought it, that it might be taken for park.

We realize the hearing had to be streamlined, otherwise it would deteriorate into a town meeting affair. However, the requirement as printed in the newspapers, that letters to your committee had to be in copies of 25 each was a hardship imposed on the citizens that might want to be heard. That in itself, squashed many people from writing your office.

What has happened to the beach areas in the past 50 years should serve as a measure to show what to expect from it in the future. It will show you a gradual washing away of all the great outer beach and the reduction of it to flat narrow strips subject to the usual wearing away each winter.

What we want to do is enjoy the beach now, before it is all gone.

As far as the other towns are concerned, it is up to them to speak for themselves.

It is also up to the towns up the cape not in the proposed park area to mind their own business and stay home, when hearings were held.

So let us get busy and vote for the park now.

Yours truly,

IRVING C. HENDERSON.

ROBINSON & HENSON,
New York, December 15, 1960.

Representative GRACIE PFOST,
Town Hall,
Eastham, Mass.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PFOST: A letter received this day from Senator Saltonstall encloses a notice of your hearings, in Eastham, on the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore. At his suggestion, I submit this statement of my views; and I trust that it may be received before your hearings are concluded.

I am a property owner in, and a longtime (50 years) summer resident of, the town of Orleans. I am in full sympathy with the principles of conservation; and I should favor any legislation, Federal, State or local, that would effectively and genuinely preserve Cape Cod. However, if S. 2636 (which is the only bill I have seen) is enacted without change, I should fear that the result would be to exploit, rather than preserve, the cape.

With his letter, to me, Senator Saltonstall sent me a copy of an open letter dated September 22, 1960, and addressed to the citizens of the cape by him and Senator Kennedy jointly. On the second page of that letter, it is stated "* * * we feel that the provisions of the bill and the record of the Park Service give promise that preservation of the area would not be frustrated by excessive and indiscriminate recreational uses." I am sorry to say that I can see no such promise either in the bill, as written, or in the record of the Park Service. To the contrary.

In an editorial in the local Orleans newspaper last summer, a magazine article was quoted as follows: "In a national park you do not fear to form an attachment to what you see lest you return to find it bulldozed out for a gas station." Unfortunately, however, that reassuring sentiment does not appear to be justified. The fact seems to be that one must fear that what he has seen and become attached to in a national park may very well be bulldozed out for a gas station. It has happened; and it has happened to me. Moreover, the beautiful bit of remote and unspoiled wilderness in a national park to which I had formed my attachment was not only bulldozed out for a gas station, but for a motel, a restaurant, a store, trailer camps, tent cities, a marina with hordes of noisy outboard motorboats for hire, an enormous and hideous power station, etc.

This desecration (I have no other word) has only recently taken place in the Everglades National Park; and, for a more detailed description of it, I refer you to an article, complete with colored illustrations, in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

I do not know, and therefore cannot say, whether the Park Service has been guilty of similar conduct in every other, or, indeed, in any other, national park. But it happened in the Everglades: and it might happen on Cape Cod.

I see no promise in the record of the Park Service that the cape will not be exploited, rather than preserved; and I see none in the provisions of S. 2636. What was done in the Everglades was done in the face of a constituent statute that provides in express terms that the area "shall be permanently reserved as a wilderness, and no development * * * shall be undertaken which will interfere with the preservation intact of * * * primitive natural conditions * * *." (16 U.S.C.A., sec. 410(c).) If what occurred in the Everglades could be carried out in disregard of that unqualified statutory prohibition, what could be expected on the cape under S. 2636 which provides (sec. 9(b)) that "the Secretary shall develop * * *." The scheme of S. 2636 seems to be to omit standards and criteria of administration and to leave all such matters to the discretion of the Service. I do not think this is safe.

To list every specific development to be permitted or prohibited would make for an unwieldy statute, and would also involve the risk of omitting some important provision. Further, in view of what has happened in the Everglades, and in order to insure some force to the statute, it would be necessary to provide some means by which the Park Service could be restrained from any excess. A more feasible possible remedy might be to prohibit any development not first approved by the Advisory Council set up in sec. 10 of the bill, or, preferably, by the selectmen of the town in which a proposed development would be located.

If this would be a provision unusual in national park statutes, so also are the circumstances unusual. Cape Cod is neither a desert, a swamp, nor a wilderness. It is a densely populated community with 320 years of history behind it; and it has, I submit, the inherent right to prevent exploitation, whether by avaricious developers or the National Park Service. Each town has a character of its own, fixed by literally hundreds of years of life and tradition; and each town should, I urge, be entitled to prevent the installation or operation within its borders of trailer camps, tent cities or other developments, if, and to the extent that, the same would be obnoxious to it.

To give the towns such veto powers would not be to permit, but only to prevent, changes in the character of the cape. It would thus ipso facto conform to the fundamental principles of conservation declared by the act of August 25, 1916; and I cannot see how the National Park Service could object to it, unless the Service contemplates some activity that would be at variance with those principles of conservation.

There seems to be an urge to get some statute on the books in record time; but I think it would be better to be late than sorry.

Respectfully,

TRUMAN HENSON.

CHATHAM, MASS., *December 21, 1960.*

Re Cape Cod National Seashore.

Hon. GRACIE PFOST,
Member of Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. PFOST: Please record my definite letter in favor of the establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore as a federally administered area under the National Park Service.

In this connection I am speaking as a private citizen and as a resident of Chatham since 1952. Having had a rigorous tour of duty in Government service myself—an ardent New Dealer, Bureau of Marine Inspection, Air-Sea Rescue under Joint Chiefs of Staffs, and continuous Government contact in other areas—I was instrumental in pushing through the bill to provide the dike which makes possible the access to Morris Island and Monomoy. Since I personally hand-carried the petition around the town of Chatham and then took it to the U.S. Army Engineers Office in Washington, and then prodded and pushed it through the good offices of Senator Kennedy and Senator Saltonstall, using every known method to move it along, I do have some background as to why it was necessary to close the dike. This breakthrough occurred in 1938 in a hurricane. The town consequently lost the use of Stage Harbor both as a harbor of refuge and more important, as a fish and shellfish breeding area. This loss alone amounted to an estimated $300,000 a year. This was spelled out in my petition and the U.S. Army Engineers received it cordially and cooperated fully in following through to build the dike and dredge the harbor, which has been a great boon to the town.

However, the access created has somehow shifted the emphasis of what was actually accomplished to a sort of "get rich quick" attitude in regard to building development of Morris Island. It simply is not true that Chatham needs the tax money and the building trade employment which the development by private subdivision would bring. Morris Island would be sacrificed for temporary gain. It belongs in the park along with Monomoy to give continuity to the north-south seashore line and bird and wildlife flyway and migratory area. There are available many hundreds of acres for building development in the town of Chatham without spoiling the choicest piece of the cape's southern heritage.

Cape Codders are a sweet, cooperative, and kind group of individualistic Americans. They have, like my native Maine Yankees, a built-in anti-Federal, anti-Government resistance. They were, as perhaps you know, famed as "Mooncussers" since they resisted to the last gasp Federal attempts (or any other—even private) to establish lighthouses to guide ships away from the treacherous shoals. Reason: These damned lighthouses would spoil the "wrecking" business just as the moonlight night did.

At this point, the committee should proceed to move forward to assist the inhabitants of the lovely area to realize that their heritage of sand, sea, surf, and wildlife is best cared for under the wing of the Federal Government.

The U.S. Army Engineers should, in my judgment, also be asked by the committee (and a provision should be included in the final bill enacted) to study the relationship of the bays and harbors on Cape Cod with reference to the necessity for more lift bridges and dredged channels. I have in mind in this connection our own Mitchell River bridge in Chatham. This bridge will, in the next few years, need conversion into a bascule type such as Osterville has, at which time the channel under it into the Mill Pond, should be dredged to give beautiful access to the center of the town for yachts which will thus be enabled to proceed into those water areas.

Only by foresight in these matters now can all Americans be assured of the availability of these beautiful shores under Federal conservatory care to their children and their children's children.

Yours very sincerely,

EARLE F. HISCOCK.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., *December 15, 1960.*

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is my understanding that a hearing on the proposed national seashore park on Cape Cod is to be held this month.

I am the owner of a house and property in Truro, Mass., and have been for the past 8 years. For 15 summers previous to that time I have been a summer resident there. I have witnessed the gradual deterioration of the natural resources there due to the inroads of private and selfish interests. This is not a generalization. On the beautiful old County Road from Truro to Wellfleet, whole woods and dunes have been destroyed to carry sand to other areas for commercial or private uses.

Those who oppose the establishment of a national park in the area are doing so largely for narrow selfish interests. I strongly urge you to do all in your power to see that the interests of the great majority of people in our country are preserved.

Since I cannot be at the hearings this month, kindly make my affirmative stand for a national park a part of the records. Thank you.

Yours truly,

EUGENE JACKSON.

EASTHAM, MASS., *December 20, 1960.*

Hon. GRACIE PFOST,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM: Further to the House hearing on the Cape Cod National Seashore, which you presided over in our town hall last week.

I attended this hearing in full, and the hearing held by the Senate a year ago. I have read nearly all that has been written, pro and con, and I have talked to many of our local people who live here.

In correspondence with Congressman Hastings Keith, who is our representative, I have favored the park from the very start, and still do but with restrictions: (1) The taking of much less land; (2) adequate tax relief to the towns concerned; (3) adequate protection for the property owners within the proposed park; and (4) that we will never have to pay an admission to walk on our own beach.

I have now had time to peruse the study and report by Van Ness Bates Associates, entitled "The Cape and the Park" made for the Massachusetts Improvement Association, and the boundary suggested in this report is the closest to what I have had in mind from the start, and is more in keeping with what many of the local people have in mind—irrespective of the boundary proposed by the National Park Service. Of three studies I have read, this is the most useful and practical, and is worth serious consideration by you and your committee.

I have been a property owner here for some years, and I retired here nearly 3 years ago, because the Cape Cod way of life is good for older people. I try to see this proposed park from the standpoint of those of us who live here, as well as from the standpoint of preserving our great beach on the Atlantic Ocean for the people of our country as a whole, and for posterity. I believe there is a happy medium, and that the Van Ness Bates boundary will do the job, please most of the local people, and make a satisfactory seashore park.

I would appreciate these remarks being included in the final report. I am sure our lower cape people appreciated the courtesy and consideration you and your committee extended to us, by looking the proposed location of the park over in person, and in turn, we trust you enjoyed your visit on this historical "Narrow Land."

Very sincerely,

FREDERICK H. JEWELL.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *December 13, 1960.*

Hon WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: We understand that hearings are to be held on the Cape Cod National Seashore at Eastham on December 16 and 17. We would very much like to appear before these hearings, but other commitments make this impossible. I did have the privilege of appearing before your committee very briefly when hearings were held in Washington on June 21, 1960, and the testimony which I gave to the committee at that time as well as to the Senate committee is now part of the record.

At this time we would like to emphasize three important aspects of this situation:

(1) The continued delay in congressional action on this proposal has allowed most damaging, speculative activity in the area projected by the Department of the Interior for this park. It is most important, in our opinion, that unequivocal clarification and action by the Department of the Interior be taken in order to make clear that the status quo as of September 30, 1959, will be preserved so far as is legally possible and fair. There should be no reward for the real estate speculators or no penalty for their unprotected customers.

(2) So far as we can see, the sentiment among the visitors to the cape is overwhelmingly in favor of the establishment of the park at the earliest possible date. Speed is essential in order to preserve the area envisioned from further erosion by selfish interests. These sentiments are shared by a majority of Massachusetts residents, their Senators and Governor, if not by a very large proportion of the residents of the cape including those in the affected area.

(3) We respectfully submit that the interests of all these groups, both national, regional, and local, should be considered by your committee. We feel that it is one of the responsibilities of representative government to protect the interests of the Nation despite the very vocal outcries of a small minority, whose selfish interests lead them to such frenetic action as has been evidenced by the opponents of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

We urge upon you and your committee on our own behalf, as well as on behalf of those tens of thousands who treasure Cape Cod as well as on behalf of the best interests of the cape itself, that the plans of the Department of the Interior now be carried into law. For this purpose we feel that the provisions of S. 2636 and the companion House bill, as originally introduced by Congressman Hastings Keith, are eminently suitable.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT S. LEVY.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *December 22, 1960.*

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I hope I am not too late in expressing my wish to have immediate action taken in favor of the Cape Cod National Seashore Park. Please do all you can in its favor, for the cape means a great deal to me and to my parents, who were raised in Brewster.

I am conscious that there are a great many more who feel as we do, and that the cape is not really for Cape Codders alone, as a recent article so aptly stated. I have read the detailed report by the Department of the Interior, and am aware of the issues involved. However, though change of landscape is inevitable by the slow processes of nature, I firmly believe that the kind of change implied by those who do not want a park, is bad and should be checked—checked by those who foresee the effects of despoilation of the pinewoods, dunes and ponds. By making room for motels and souvenir stands, the Cape Codders are only defeating themselves.

I believe that I speak for many who love the cape as a place of beauty, a place for relaxation and reflection, a place for taking walks and for fishing in the many ponds, a place for swimming and challenging the breakers at Nauset, a place for lying in a hammock in the woods and throwing pinecones at trees, a place for listening to the cry of gulls and for watching the sunset over the flats in a quiet evening. Please do what you can to preserve all this.

Thank you.

ROBERT LOUD.

AMHERST, MASS., *December 8, 1960.*

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As the owner of 30 acres in Wellfleet on the lower cape, extending from ocean front to the ponds area, I am naturally concerned with the preservation of this region in its natural undeveloped state. I am for this reason in support of the project to establish an outer Cape Cod National Seashore Park, and this without delay. Attempts to alter the boundaries of the park as outlined in the original bill insofar as these would affect the Gull Pond area concern me greatly, however, as further development of the kind that has been pushed lately would so alter the character of this natural wooded section as to defeat a major objective of the proposed park.

Since I shall not be able to attend the public hearings in Eastham set for the middle of this month I should like herewith to register my protest against reduction, in this particular region at least, of the park area as delimited in the proposed bill.

Sincerely yours,

ALLISON W. MARSH.

STATEMENT OF THE MASSACHUSETTS CONSERVATION COUNCIL RELATIVE TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK

The Great Outer Beach of Cape Cod, from Nauset Inlet to Race Point, is one of the few remaining natural stretches of beach along the entire Atlantic coast that has remained undespoiled by real estate developers, garish billboards, and honky-tonks. Thoreau once described the area as " * * * the best of all places to see the ocean."

Containing the most spectacular sand dunes of the Atlantic coastal area, the plateau is dotted with numerous small ponds dug out thousands of years ago by glaciers. Nowhere else along the coast from Maine to Florida can one find the same plant and animal life association present in this area. Pine and oak forests, beach plum and bayberry thickets, wild blueberry patches, salt marshes, the wide variety of shore and inland birds, together with the wild mammals, including a large deer herd, make this a paradise for both the ecology student and the layman who wants only a place to relax and enjoy the natural resources of the area.

During the past 4 years, several studies have been made of the area to determine its suitability as a national seashore park. Voluminous reports have been prepared which outline the steps which should be taken to preserve the natural wonders of this unique area. Conferences have been held to discuss these reports, and public hearings have been held to provide for the expression of individual opinions on the merits of a national seashore park in this location. Legislation to authorize and activate the project has died in Congress. This is as far as we have progressed.

Meanwhile, the bulldozers are biting out huge chunks of natural areas, leveling them for access roads to future summer homes. One especially fine tract is now bisected by a graded, gravel road 50 feet wide, and narrower streets running east and west from this trunkline have been partially laid out. It is only a matter of time before this area is dotted with residences, and time is rapidly running out.

It is only natural that some fear the loss of tax revenue through Federal ownership will have adverse effects on the economy of the local communities. This reaction has occurred near other national parks when they were first proposed. Experience elsewhere, however, has proved these fears to be without justification. Annual benefits from increased service facilities, located outside the park boundaries, to handle the tourist trade more than offset the real estate tax losses.

Action is long overdue. It is time to stop talking, roll up our sleeves, and get to work.

We cannot save the area from development merely by writing and talking about it. If we are to save " * * * the best of all places to see the ocean," we must act immediately, or the opportunity will be lost forever.

ALFRED M. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Secretary, Massachusetts Conservation Council.

THE MAY INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH
OF THE JEWISH HOSPITAL,
Cincinnati, Ohio, December 19, 1960.

Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ASPINALL: May I urge you to work unceasingly to establish a national park on Cape Cod, Mass. Such a park is greatly needed to preserve this beautiful historic area.

I write not only as a person born in Massachusetts, but one who still spends his summers there.

It would be very kind of you to enter my letter as part of the record of the hearings.

Respectfully yours,

BENJAMIN F. MILLER, M.D.,
Chemical Engineer, Director, (Associate Professor of Experimental Medicine, University of Cincinnati College of Medicine).

CHESTNUT HILL, MASS., *December 16, 1960.*

Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Care of Eastham Town Hall, Eastham, Mass.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: I would like to take this opportunity to urge upon you and your committee a favorable decision concerning the Cape Cod Seashore Park bill.

It has been my good fortune to have visited many areas of our country, and I feel that I can say that Cape Cod is one of the few remaining unspoiled areas available to the public for recreation, scientific, and historical activities.

While I realize that a number of people will have to make sacrifices for the establishment of such a park, it is my opinion that the ultimate goals of this project would afford much greater rewards for our own and future generations. For this reason, I hope that your committee will act swiftly and favorably upon this matter.

Sincerely yours,

SANFORD A. MILLER, Ph. D.

NEW BEDFORD, MASS., *December 16, 1960.*

Hon. GRACIE PFOST,
Chairman, Eastham, Mass.

DEAR MRS. PFOST: The Massachusetts State Labor Council AFL–CIO wishes to be recorded in favor of the proposal to establish a national seashore on the outer banks of Cape Cod. We sincerely hope that this committee will report favorably on the establishment of this Cape Cod National Park.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. MURPHY,
Vice President, Massachusetts State Labor Council, AFL–CIO.

NATIONAL PARKS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: In response to invitation, the National Parks Association has submitted a statement in general support of the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park for inclusion in the record of the hearings of the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with respect to H.R. 9050.

A copy of our statement is enclosed herewith for your convenience.

Cordially yours,

ANTHONY WAYNE SMITH,
Executive Secretary.

THE PROPOSED CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK—STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL PARKS ASSOCIATION IN GENERAL SUPPORT OF THE KEITH BILL, H.R. 9050, TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK, DECEMBER 16–17, 1960

The National Parks Association appreciates the invitation to present its views to the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with respect to the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

The association is a national conservation organization with headquarters at 1300 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. It is an educational and scientific association founded in 1919 by Stephen T. Mather, first Director of the National Park Service. It undertakes, among others of its responsibilities, to make objective studies of proposals for the enlargement of the Federal system of national parks and monuments and to determine whether areas are of a caliber for inclusion in the system.

The association recommends quite strongly, after careful investigation, that the proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park be added to the system of parks and monuments, generally, as proposed in the Keith bill, H.R. 9050, and in the companion legislation introduced by Senators Kennedy and Saltonstall in the Senate.

There is great need for the protection of representative examples of the original beaches and shorelines of America before they are monopolized by private real estate development. It is only a short decade or two, as shown by Park Service studies, since there were many hundreds of miles of open shoreline along the Atlantic, the Gulf, the Pacific, and the Great Lakes, which were freely available to the general public for recreational purposes. Subdivision and other private development have been crowding the public out of these seashore areas very rapidly; unless vigorous action is taken promptly to protect the remainder, the opportunity to do so will soon be gone forever.

The scenic, recreational, artistic, and scientific resources of the outer arm of Cape Cod are unique in America and quite irreplaceable. A substantial amount of the region is in public ownership and should remain that way; unified management by the National Park Service is desirable. The present private holdings, both in the settlements and in the more open country are, in large part, completely compatible with the protection of the traditional values of the area. Much of the present residential value of these holdings, particularly in the open country, is dependent on the prevention of indiscriminate subdivision and overcrowding.

There is considerable wildlife which also ought to be protected against urbanization, including a large population of resident shore birds, migratory waterfowl, marine life, and game animals. The habitat of this wildlife can be preserved only by preventing the excessive construction of roads and buildings; this is important from the point of view of both hunting and the preservation of flora and fauna for artistic and scientific purposes.

We note that the proposed legislation reserves control of hunting and fishing to the Secretary of the Interior, while granting him discretion as to whether they should be permitted at all, and the extent to which management should be shared; we believe that these provisions are good, but that the Secretary's protective and managerial authority must not be weakened.

We have no objection to the inclusion of the Monomoy Wildlife Refuge within the proposed park, although we have some doubt as to the necessity of such inclusion; but we would very definitely recommend that section 9(c) of the bill make any recreational use of any migratory bird refuge within the park subject to approval of the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

The Monomoy refuge is an extremely important link in the migratory bird refuge system, and for the protection of shore birds generally. Any opening of the area for recreational use should be very carefully controlled, and should be excluded if there be any doubt as to compatibility with protection; these powers must be reserved for the Wildlife Bureau.

The same would apply to section 9(d) of the bill. Permission for hunting in any migratory bird refuge within the park must, at the very least, be subject to approval by the Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; in fact, depending on his recommendations now, it had best be expressly prohibited; this is a flaw in the bill which seems to have been overlooked.

The boundaries of the proposed park seem to be well considered, with one exception: We would recommend that the area between the Province Lands and Route 6 in Provincetown be included in the park; otherwise the boundaries will run arbitrarily through Clapps Pond and Duck Pond and the adjacent marshes, areas which ought to be protected for their wildlife potential and which are already severed from the Provincetown settlement by the highway. There is ample open space between the highway and the settlement for community expansion.

We do take strong exception to one section of the bill, section 5, and we would urge that it be stricken from the proposed legislation. This is the section which permits additional residential development within the boundaries of the proposed park, allowing an acreage measured by 10 percent of the privately owned property within the park in each town.

As we read this provision, the Secretary would be obliged to designate the property on which such development would be permitted. We do not believe that any such arrangement is administratively workable. Developmental rights would have to be granted proportionately to all private landowners; if each were allowed 10 percent of his holdings or less, isolated and spotty construction might take place, with serious problems of utilities and access.

Even if workable procedures could be established, the entire 10 percent proposal is objectionable because it is in conflict with the basic purposes for which the park is to be established. Broad authority is given to the Secretary to acquire residential holdings within the boundaries of the park; provision is made for the acquisition of such holdings, subject to life or 25-year tenancies; such acquisition can proceed by negotiation even though the power of eminent domain may be suspended; yet this conflicting provision is to be introduced whereby further residential development will be going on continually.

There might be some point to this provision if the boundaries of the park had not been drawn to leave large areas in each township for residential or other development. But in Provincetown a substantial amount of land is excluded; around North Truro and Truro about one-third of the width of the cape is excluded; around Wellfleet and South Wellfleet large areas, amounting to half of the width of the cape, are left for development, and from South Wellfleet on down the cape, the proposed park narrows to little more than a stretch of open beach. There is plenty of room for the settlements to grow indefinitely, particularly if they plan their development with the aid of modern zoning ordinances, such as the proposed legislation contemplates.

Information is not readily available as to the amount of private land within the proposed park in the various towns; presumably it is substantial, excepting in Provincetown; the 10 percent provision might seriously reduce the total acreage of the park.

The 10 percent provision is, in our judgment, in conflict with the purposes of the bill and unnecessary to the future of the communities on the cape; in fact, the future of these communities, in the long run, is largely dependent on the protection of the natural beauty of the cape, and will be injured by further development within the boundaries of the proposed park.

We are not at all certain that the $15 million authorized for land acquisition will be sufficient. This limitation, in and of itself, may prevent even the negotiated acquisition of any substantial amount of improved residential property. If acquisition is to be undertaken, it should be of an area adequate for the purpose. The importance of the proposed park is so great that reasonable appropriations should not be stinted.

We wish to compliment the sponsors of this legislation on the competence with which the bill has been drafted. It is one thing to create a national park out of untouched wilderness in the public domain or a national forest; it is quite another to set up a park of this kind for the protection of a scenic area which has already been substantially settled. Other crowded countries, such as Great Britain, have been experimenting with various methods of protecting regions as parks in which settlement is already considerable. In America we will also have to look ahead toward similar solutions in areas where development has occurred, but where there are scenic, recreational, and wildlife resources which must be preserved. The proposed Cape Cod National Seashore Park will have great value for test and demonstration purposes in this respect.

In this connection we should note that parks of this kind are to be distinguished sharply from our great primeval national parks like Sequoia, Olympic, and the others, in which many of the uses contemplated here would be completely incompatible. This association is completely opposed to permitting hunting in any of the great primeval parks; likewise, residential inholdings of the kind which will obviously be permitted here for a long time are not compatible with rounding out public ownership in the big parks. The difference in categories is sufficiently marked by the inclusion of the term "seashore" in the present legislation.

We conclude by urging all possible speed in the enactment of this bill. So-called improvement and subdivision have been stimulated by its pendency, and great harm can be done unless we move rapidly toward the completion of the project.

National Wildlife Federation,
Washington, D.C., December 19, 1960.

Mrs. Gracie Pfost,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mrs. Pfost: We should like the opportunity of inserting in the record of the hearings held December 16–17, 1960, a statement on behalf of the establishment of a Cape Cod National Seashore. In reality, this statement supplements one presented by the National Wildlife Federation to the committee on June 21, 1960, on the same proposal.

It should be pointed out that the National Wildlife Federation is an organization composed of affiliates in 49 States and the District of Columbia. These affiliates are made up of more than 2 million individual sportsmen-conservationists.

The National Wildlife Federation is concerned about the establishment of this and several other shoreline recreation areas, as outlined in the following resolution adopted in annual convention earlier this year:

"Whereas shoreline areas bordering such water areas as the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, the Gulf of Mexico, Great Lakes, and many river systems offer invaluable recreational opportunities; and,

"Whereas suitable shoreline recreational locations are fast dwindling in number due to private development, including industrial; and,

"Whereas, outdoor recreational needs are continually mounting as the population increases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation endorses the principle of establishing national shoreline recreation areas for public use and petitions the 86th Congress to give early consideration to establishing such areas as Padre Island in Texas, Cape Cod in Massachusetts, in the Oregon Dunes of Oregon, Point Reyes in California, and in other suitable areas; and, be it further

"*Resolved*, That legislation establishing such areas and regulations promulgated concerning them by the administering departments should recognize and provide for public hunting and fishing where feasible, and in cooperation with the State game and fish agency, as one of the appropriate forms of recreation."

We have been in close contact with personnel of our affiliate in Massachusetts and representatives of State resource agencies there. They assure us that details of H.R. 9050 apparently have worked out to the mutual satisfaction of everyone concerned. It is the hope of the National Wildlife Federation that the committee can see fit to give early favorable consideration to this measure when it is reintroduced in the 87th Congress.

Thank you for the opportunity of making these comments.

Sincerely,

Thomas L. Kimball,
Executive Director.

New England Farm & Garden Association, Inc.,
Boston 16, Mass., December 9, 1960.

Hon. Wayne Aspinall, *Chairman.*

Dear Mr. Aspinall: Through its board of directors, the New England Farm and Garden Association wishes to go on record as favoring the rejection of the proposals to exclude parts of Eastham, Truro, and Wellfleet in connection with the establishment of a Cape Cod National Seashore Park. We cannot too strongly urge you to use your influence in seeing that these proposals are not incorporated in this highly important bill which has already been dangerously weakened.

Yours very truly,

E. K. Cook
Mrs. Robert H. Cook,
Corresponding Secretary.

A Statement Pertaining to the Proposed National Seashore

(By Edward Norman, Chatham, Mass.)

Cooperative bird bander for the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Formerly associated in research and banding with the late Dr. Oliver Austin, owner and director of the Austin Ornithological Research Station in Wellfleet.

Interim warden of Tern Island in Chatham for the Massachusetts Audubon Society prior to the establishment of the Wellfleet Bay Sanctuary.

Member of the following ornithological societies: American Ornithologists Union, National Audubon Society, Wilson Ornithological Society, Massachusetts Audubon Society, Cooper Ornithological Society, and Northeastern Bird-Banding Association.

As an ornithologist, I would like to make some observations on conservation in relation to the national seashore and Monomoy and Morris Islands in Chatham. As a conservationist, I am primarily interested in the birdlife in these areas.

To state in brief:

Monomoy Island is now well managed by the Fish and Wildlife Service, so any change in jurisdiction might have a tendency to subordinate conservation of wildlife to recreation for humans.

Morris Island, to be preserved for the existing wildlife, would be best as a limited residential development, as now planned, rather than converted to a tenting, hiking, and picnicking area as proposed by the national seashore.

The basic and overall theory of widespread conservation practices, as promoted by various Federal and State agencies, conservation societies, and independent groups, is an easily understandable policy where it approaches the general area of the outer cape. However, some sections of the area to be encompassed within the tentative boundaries of the Cape Cod National Seashore, being more complex, require closer examination especially in the relationship of man and his impact on these natural resources.

The areas of Morris Island and Monomoy in the town of Chatham are considered within the fringe area of the Cape Cod National Seashore. Morris Island is joined to the land by a substantial causeway. Monomoy is separated from Morris Island by an ever increasing tidal breakthrough. This island of Monomoy, a narrow dune strip leading to the south a distance of some 10 miles, is now under the control and development of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, having been acquired from the town of Chatham by an Act of Declaration in 1944 for the specific purpose of a waterfowl refuge. Therefore, it is of prime importance that the jurisdiction be free from any confliction of purpose from any other agency—on this point—to be specific, the National Seashore, the prime purpose of which is providing recreation for humans.

For many decades the island of Monomoy has been considered and judged one of the most important habitat areas on the New England coast for spring and fall migrations of waterfowl and shore birds. The winter and summer seasons are of equal importance but have received less publicity because the astronomical numbers are lacking. However, it is a well-known fact in conservation practices that these lower counts are of great importance as they may indicate a decreasing population rate necessitating more stringent protective measures; for example, the surveillance of the whooping crane, whistling swan, American eagle, the condor, and others in similar circumstances where numerical position is shown to be insecure.

Incursion of humans within the nesting areas of shore birds and waterfowl, and particularly the tern family, results in the decimation of the potential number of young to be successfully fledged. The tern colony in years past maintained itself on the outer reaches of North Beach but of late has been greatly reduced by the intrusion of vehicular traffic overriding the nesting areas. As the traffic is on the increase, the necessity of maintaining the present protection of Monomoy under the Fish and Wildlife Service control becomes more imperative for the existing tern colony in this area. This colony, made up of common, Arctic, roseate, and least terns, for the past 50 years has been one of the objects of the Massachusetts Audubon Society in their conservation activities.

In scientific studies carried out by the Austin Ornithological Research Station in Wellfleet during the past 30 years, it has been defined many times that the existence of any species depends for survival upon the unbroken tradition of nesting areas, and furthermore, that when this association is broken, the recovery of population takes many years, the area sometimes remaining barren of previous species.

In conclusion, the waterfowl group, being highly complex and specialized in both form and habit, draws attention by its dwindling numbers in some species and variable numbers in many species. This indicates the continued need to maintain the island of Monomoy under the present and singular control of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

It is necessary to approach the subject of conservation on Morris Island from a point of the adaptability of wildlife to humans. This area being geographically a part of the landmass of the town of Chatham, now has well-paved roads, subjecting it to a moderate amount of traffic. Therefore, the idea of an undeveloped Morris Island has become unrealistic and negative. The proposed plan of the national seashore to use it as a camping and picnicking area, or any similar uses for the anticipated great numbers of itinerant visitors, in so small an area would be one that would disrupt completely the balance of nature with the inevitable results of making the area untenable to the less adaptable forms of wildlife. The projected influx of transients is clearly manifested in the proposal of the Cape Cod National Seashore brochure, published by the National Park Service, by the following statement:

"Now it is within a day's travel of nearly one-third of our Nation's population—less than 300 highway miles from all six New England capitals and New York City, an hour and a half by air from Washington, D.C., and as transportation improvements continue to cut time and distance, the cape is ever closer to all America."

The general ecology of Morris Island is eminently suited to the landforms, as bird censuses have shown a great variety of migrant and nesting and permanent species. In the evolution of avian life, these species are considered to be on a more highly developed plane, being more flexible in their habits of feeding and nesting; therefore, they are adaptable to moderate changed and limited contact with man. The reasonable goal is for man and wildlife to reside on Morris Island in harmony.

For Morris Island, the existing plan is for a restricted residential area. Here man, knowledgeable in the ways of conservation, has chosen by his own self-imposed regulations to limit his impact on wildlife; first, by the number of location where he is to dwell; second, by rigid controls and restrictions of the use of the acreage. These limitations are so designed that the natural beauty and ecology of the area would remain intact.

In surveys of parallel ecology, but with somewhat smaller zoned areas for man, the wildlife environment has been greatly improved by the beneficial horticultural change and the high rate of incidence of feeding stations resulting in greatly increased numbers and varieties of bird species. An outstanding example is the Harbor Coves area, a residential development in Chatham. Formerly this location was an abandoned, rundown farm with the subsequent impoverished, surface eroded soil only capable of maintaining a limited wildlife population. From these conditions the land has been reclaimed, creating a natural parklike environment, rich in food sources and nesting sites. The prevailing trend of residential beautification by landscaping has provided the berry-producing bushes for food and the variety of trees and shrubs for nesting that has made Harbor Coves an ideal sanctuary capable of sustaining a vastly increased bird population. This increase of the variety and number of species has been due primarily to the introduction of such plants as: viburnums, yews, junipers, dogwoods, privets, barberries and countless other fruiting species.

There is no doubt that the proposed plan for the restricted development of Morris Island, being one of the finest in the community, would bring the same and doubtless more extensive benefits to wildlife. As the ultimate plan is to restore and maintain the balance of nature that is consistent with the requirements of the expanding activities of man, it is apparent that this proposed residential plan far outweighs other alternative propositions.

The late Ludlow Griscom, former chairman of the board of the National Audubon Society, pointed out the advantages of such evolution in the following statement:

"When Cape Cod was primeval beach and red oak forests, where were the 50 species of summer resident birds which are now found in the pitch pine and scrub oak and in the shade trees and orchards in the vicinity of the various villages? The point, is that the number of species which have become adapted to civilization and which may be presumed to have increased their former numbers under primeval conditions, is greatly in excess of those which have become extinct, which are vanishing, or which are in need of protection."

(COMMITTEE NOTE.—The following letter was included at the request of Congressman Hastings Keith.)

PLYMOUTH SAVINGS BANK,
Plymouth, Mass., September 2, 1960.

MR. HASTINGS KEITH, Esq.,
West Bridgewater, Mass.

DEAR SIR: * * *.

I come now to the outer reaches of Cape Cod and the proposition of having the Federal Government take them over for a public beach. My wife and I collect shells, having at the moment some 1,200 varieties. Last May we managed to squeeze in 2 weeks' vacation, our first in 20 months. After visiting our daughter in Simsbury we headed for Greenwich, Conn., on Long Island Sound at the Connecticut-New York line.

We worked our way through Greenwich Beach, Old Greenwich, Stamford Town Beach, Noroton Point, Sherwood Island State Beach, Hammonesett (spelling not guaranteed) State Beach, Clinton Town Beach, and several others in Connecticut, went on to East Sand Cove Beach, Nazareth, and two or three others in Rhode Island, then to Horse Neck Beach, South Cape Beach, Parker River, Hyannis Harbor, Chatham, Truro, Head of the Meadows, Provincetown, all on the outer side of the cape.

We also tackled Provincetown Harbor, Nauset, Wellfleet, and Orleans on the inside of the cape. We had previously done Barnstable, Sagamore, Sandwich, Manomet, White Horse, Plymouth, Duxbury, Marshfield, all near home, and 2 years ago did the north shore all the way up through York Beach, Ogunquit, Orr's Island, Muscongus, Deer Island to Bar Harbor.

All of which is to indicate that we know something about beaches and why we view with horror the idea of the Federal Government taking over the outer cape as a national seashore. To explain I must group the beaches in certain rough classifications and describe conditions as we saw them.

First the little town beaches, docks, etc. These are used mostly by the local people. They always evinced a great interest in what we were doing, and after showing them what we were picking up and explaining a bit about the creatures that once occupied the shell, and often still did, we usually collected a group of interested people, not by any means all children, who scoured the beach with us and brought us all kinds of things, asked us questions, and donated their trophies. It multiplied our fun manifold.

We also believe that we interested many in the shellfish of their area which some day may prove to have been very worthwhile when conservation legislation is underway.

Next we have the town beaches which are large enough to attract small crowds, as Plymouth at the head of the beach. Here there is usually a caretaker, appointed or self-appointed. We always make it a point to locate him and tell him what we are up to on his beach. Frequently he will ask us if we ever saw, for example, a clam with two snouts. We know he means the false angel wing. He will then tell us where we can find them or even go down and help gather a dozen or so. These beaches are usually equipped with trash cans and patrolled sufficiently so that necking parties and booze fights are at a minimum and the beaches cleared of broken bottles, trash, and so on. There are also enough locals so that everything is under control morally and physically because of their pride and exemplary good behavior.

Next come the State beaches, Sherwood Island, Hammonesett, Horse Neck. Here we encounter specific parking lots, and they are necessary, usually a quarter to half a mile from the beach. Here it is necessary to lug our equipment, rubber boots, clam hoe, buckets, sieves, scoops and what not down to the beach and every time we move 50 feet we have to bring the equipment with us. This is something we should put up with for the privilege of going on the beach at all. But here we encounter the crowd that think because it is a State beach, that they own it and can do as they please. The atmosphere loses the friendly interest, and if it does not become hostile at least there is marked disinterest or an inclination to be "funny." We have had our equipment not stolen, but messed around with, our buckets and screw-top jars filled with sand or hidden or emptied or a dead fish or two added. It is impossible to clean a mile or 2-mile beach while it is occupied, and while it may start clean in the morning, by noon it is usually pretty messy. This is particularly true if there are hotdog or popcorn stands and the like. These adjuncts seem to attract a type which frequently never even goes on the beach or in the water.

I think the difference is that the smaller the beach the more it is used by the local citizenry, but as it gets larger and especially if it is patently arranged for the enjoyment of the citizenry at large, and for the very reason that it is State owned and operated, the enforcement of even the most obvious rules, such as not breaking glass on the beach, becomes more and more difficult and the attitude of a larger number becomes not, "So what—we don't own it" but rather, "This is our beach—we'll do as we please."

I wonder then what will happen if we move up one more step to Federal ownership and operation. I am sorry but I vision it thus. Here, wide open for the enjoyment of all, on the outer cape, is one of the most beautiful stretches of sand beach in all of New England. For example: One day we drove to Truro Light Beach. The road is pretty good, not a four-lane highway with limited access but a good two-lane, hard-surfaced road. There were two cars in the little parking lot near the beach. As we unloaded our gear the car next to us began unloading its gear, surf casting rods, lures, rubber boots, baskets, etc. They were fascinated with our screens, scoops, etc. In no time we were each explaining to the other what the items were for, how they were used and the hoped for result. The other car had already unloaded. Two men were surf casting, one lady was writing letters and another painting. We stayed there, more or less, 6 hours playing a sort of leapfrog. We would circle around the surf casters so as not to get in their way, then they would reel in and move down beyond us. Before we left we knew each other's names, and home addresses. We called their attention to surfacing fish, they picked up shells and left them, marked by a stick stuck in the sand, for us to look over.

We must have worked 3 miles up and down the beach in either direction. The next day we tried the Head of the Meadow Beach. Much the same thing happened. In fact when we worked south we came to the place where we had turned back the day before from the Truro Beach, so all in all we covered some 12 miles and we never saw a bottle, tin can, cardboard plate, nor any other item save what the sea brought in. Now, where were all these people for whom the beach is to be opened up? They had no interest in the beach as a beach. They were not there. They were somewhere where some town, county, or State had spent thousands of dollars putting up amusements for them, dance floors, movies, hotdog stands and what-not. Then if that is what they want, and what they have, why not leave the Cape Cod beaches for those who love the Cape Cod beaches, whether it be for the mental and physical enjoyment of shell collecting, surf casting, painting or just walking and soaking up the view. Why spend maybe millions putting in highways, toll gates, beach houses and amusements in a spot of perfect natural beauty for a crowd who would be just as happy in the middle of a public dump. They care nothing for the surroundings and the proof is to go to any of these beaches, that lay as God made them and see whom you find there.

And if you want proof from another point of view go to Parker River Beach just east of Hyannis. This is a small local beach maybe 200 feet in length. At either end are large signs (and you will find them at each end of all such beaches) calling attention to the fact that you are now leaving the public beach and trespassing on private property. Why are these signs there. Because the abutters have been driven crazy, not by shell collectors, not by surf casters, not by painters, and probably not by swimmers, but rather by those who, having no stake in the property and no interest in the scenery, drive up in their cars, over State-provided highways, make use of the property and when the day is over depart leaving trash, broken glass, charred remains of bonfires, and a bad taste everywhere. Even though engaged in the harmless practice of picking up dead shells, we always note these signs and if we do not see the owners and get permission, we stay strictly away from private property. And if we owned one of those properties we would put up signs too.

We do not have many national parks and so on in the East. The only one I have ever seen was Bar Harbor, the Acadia National Park. Here we had hoped to get down among the rocks and tide pools to seek for odd critters to add to our collection. But no. In every such likely place we found neat signs reading, "Please leave the flora and fauna undisturbed." This, of course, is proper for without the sign we would find, having once called the public's attention to the spot, there would soon be nothing left. Of course we did not like it much for had we swiped a dozen rough periwinkles it would never have been noticed for there were millions there. There are thousands on the rip-rap at the foot of my street here in Plymouth also, so we didn't need any, but the illustration is still good, if you take what was once free for all and improve the roads and put in entertainments so they won't have to look at what was there, and then proscribe the activities of the former visitors, you simply prove what is well known—to give something to one you must take it away from another, and in this case the other has to pay his share to have his privilege taken away.

Best regards.

Allen D. Russell.

Town of Provincetown, Mass.,
December 22, 1960.

Hon. Gracie B. Pfost,
Chairman, Public Lands Subcommittee,
Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Madam Chairman: It was obvious at the committee hearings on H.R. 9050, a bill to provide for the establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore Park, held in Eastham, Mass., on December 16 and 17, 1960, that those who testified as individuals concerning the counterproposal submitted by the officials of Provincetown were either grossly unfamiliar with the present and prospective use of land within the town or deliberately attempted to mislead the subcommittee in order to support their arguments. For that reason, there is submitted herewith for the consideration of the committee a further statement and the enclosed statement certified by Mr. John C. Corea, clerk of the Board of Assessors of Provincetown concerning present land use.

It is not my intention herein to reply to some of the statements made before you of a personal nature casting reflections on the motives of town officials for proposing the elimination of an area of the Province Lands, the State highway taking of September 1953 and other privately owned lands within the town limits. It has always been my training that any controversy or difference of opinion should be resolved by a fair appraisal of the issues, rather than the personalities involved, since to do otherwise would be, at the minimum, in extremely poor taste.

It should be apparent from the enclosed statement from the clerk of the board of assessors and the map attached thereto, both of which are respectfully requested to be placed in the record of these hearings, that the historic town of Provincetown is in vital need of suitable land within which to expand. Looking forward as best we are able to the problems of the future and the needs of the next generation, it is the unanimous opinion of the town manager, board of selectmen, and planning board that the land requested should be acquired for use of the town for residential and recreational purposes and that the boundaries of the proposed national seashore park should be modified to respect our proposal.

Chapter 123 of the Resolves of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the year 1960, which was approved by the Governor on November 3, 1960, provided for an investigation and study by a special commission relative to the conveyance by the Commonwealth of a certain portion of the Province Lands in the town of Provincetown to said town. As a member of that commission, together with the director of the division of waterways in the department of public works, and the chairman of the planning board, it may be stated that following the last meeting of this special commission on December 19, 1960, it was decided to recommend to the Massachusetts General Court a bill providing for the conveyance of these lands, as proposed to the subcommittee. Appropriate precautions for adequate zoning regulations in accordance with the Provincetown zoning bylaws, and mechanics for the disposal without commercial or other exploitation detrimental to the nature of the proposed park or to the citizens of the town will also be included.

In conclusion, it is our urgent request that the evidence presented be weighed fairly on the basis of factual, rather than fictional or conjectural, information, and that the recommendations of the subcommittee respect the boundaries proposed by the officials of our town who are acting in what we believe to be the best interests of the great majority of our citizens, and the future generations of our town.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN C. SNOW, *Chairman of Selectmen.*

OFFICE OF BOARD OF ASSESSORS,
Provincetown, Mass., December 20, 1960.

To the Honorable Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

At the request of Mr. John C. Snow, chairman of selectmen for the town of Provincetown, I have prepared from the official records of the town of Provincetown in the assessor's department, the following résumé of land use in the town of Provincetown for the year 1960 in order to resolve any questions which may have been raised concerning same.

	Acres
Grand total number of acres assessed in the town of Provincetown for the year 1960	1,854.00
The following number of acres which is included in the 1,854 total assessed acreage, but which is actually land of low value (swamps and lowlands) and ponds:	
Swamps and lowland	128.16
Ponds	19.80
Total	—147.96
Proposed land-taking by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the Pilgrim Springs Park, now privately owned and within the town of Provincetown, but proposed to be included in the national seashore park	—1,136.00
Total assessed real estate, land and buildings located in the proposed taking, based on ½ fair market value ($29,495) (assessed acres remaining)	570.04

A further breakdown of land acreage reveals the fact that of the 570.04 acres of assessable land (after the Pilgrim Springs Park taking), there is approximately 396.42 acres assessed for residential use, with approximately 173.62 acres remaining upland, which could be considered suitable for potential residential use, after proper development for/and subdivision.

The large tracts involved in the 173.62 acres of remaining upland and which are privately owned, are listed as follows:

	Acres (upland)
Wood End Development Corp	68.27
Developing & Contracting Co. of Cape Cod	24.38
New York, N.H. & H. R.R. Co	34.05
Stanley Komich	14.3
Dorothy F. Vitelli	14.52
Paul M. Foss	18.1

These large areas apparently are being held by the owners for speculative purposes and have not been subdivided or become susceptible of sale to prospective individual homeowners.

Amount of total acreage within the town of Provincetown:	
Number of acres assessed, year 1960	1,854.00
Number of acres put to public use within the town for Federal, Commonwealth and town public use, including town landings, cemeteries, land occupied by public buildings, also charitable, religious, and veterans' organizations, State historical tablets and memorials	81.20
Approximately the total number of acres as of this date in the town (this figure includes the 1.136 acres to be taken for the Pilgrim Springs Park)	1,935.20

Other data on land: 3,290 acres, Province Lands, owned and controlled by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; 311.09 acres (the total amount of acres the Commonwealth took for Route 6 highway from the town (September 1953). (See attached map.[1])

Although the land area of the town of Provincetown is designated as 8.35 square miles by official Commonwealth figures, actually the town has approximately 1,935.20 acres (assessed acres and those acres put to public use).

I certify that the foregoing data and figures are taken from the official records of the Assessor's Department of the Town of Provincetown, and are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN C. COREA,
Clerk to the Board of Assessors.

WIDENER T, HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., December 5, 1960.

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: I am writing with regard to the Cape Cod National Seashore Park. I am heartily in sympathy with what I take to be the basic purposes of this legislation. I hope very much that action may be taken in time to save the land within the designated area from further commercial exploitation and degradation.

However, I still find the language in section 8(b) (1) unsatisfactory in its failure to establish a clear priority for conservation over recreation in its statement of the purposes of the act. While the language of this section has been improved over earlier versions, it still appears to assign priority to recreational activities over conservation. According to the language of this provision, recreational activities would appear to have first claim with conservation taking what is left over.

I would accordingly respectfully submit a proposed revision of section 8(b) (1) designed to make it absolutely clear that the primary purpose of this bill is the preservation and conservation of the natural and historical phenomena of the lower cape.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, Jr.

PROPOSED REVISION OF SECTION 8(b)(1)

The park shall be permanently preserved as a primitive wilderness, and no development of the park or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken by the Secretary which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing in the area described in section 1 of this act or with the preservation of such historic sites and structures as he may designate. Where such development does not interfere with the objectives of conservation, the Secretary may develop for appropriate public uses such portions of Cape Cod National Seashore Park as he deems especially adaptable for such uses, including swimming, boating, sailing, hunting, fishing, hiking, the appreciation of historic sites and structures, and natural features of Cape Cod, and other recreational activities of similar nature.

---

[1] The map referred to may be found in the committee files.

DEDHAM, MASS., *December 14, 1960.*

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

SIR: I regret I cannot be present at the hearings on the Cape Cod Park bill (S. 2636). As a property owner and summer residents of Cape Cod, my wife and I are vitally concerned with preserving as much of the cape as possible. I favor the bill as now written (S. 2636) and only wish that it covered more land.

Respectfully yours,

R. MINTURN SEDGWICK.

COTUIT, MASS., *December 12, 1960.*

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I cannot be on the cape on December 16 and 17 to attend the meeting at Eastham, however, I point out that the outer beach cannot be used for bathing or boating.

I suggest that if you must encroach on home rule in Massachusetts, take the State beach, north of the canal in Sagamore, and enlarge and improve same.

Very truly yours,

LAURENCE C. SHAW.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *December 15, 1960.*

Hon. GRACIE PFOST,
House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Town Hall, Eastham, Mass.:

The American Automobile Association is keenly interested in any regional improvements benefiting the tourist development of Cape Cod. National Seashore Park would have highly beneficial results not only for tourists but for economy of New England in general. In fact public benefit extends beyond New England in that the park would be available within one day's drive by one-third of Nation's population. Development would be intelligent programing of our natural resources preserving a natural shoreline in best public interest and should proceed without unreasonable delay, which would cause further deterioration. All these factors should override objection on part of certain shortsighted commercial interests presently unable to see long-range benefits to the immediate area. Urge your committee's favorable consideration.

RUSSELL E. SINGER, *Executive Vice President,*
American Automobile Association.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Cambridge, Mass., December 15, 1960.

The establishment of a Cape Cod National Seashore Park will, I believe, be a great benefit to the population both adjacent to, and within convenient commuting distance to this area. This area remains as one of the few still available to these residents with free access for the purpose of bathing, wildlife studies, fishing, etc. In addition, I have noted that extremely large and an increasing number of visitors from adjacent States have been visiting Cape Cod for recreation.

To allow this area to develop casually and with little regard for the population it should serve, both present and future, will only lead to desecration of this natural resource. Certain areas have, within the immediate past, been developed for commercial purposes with little or no consideration of preservation of tidal land, wildlife, or vegetation.

If this area is to be of maximum utility for our future population, then a portion must be reserved and saved from despoilage. This will require planning and supervision from an agency with vast experience. The Department of the Interior has the necessary and proven experience and ability to do this task. In reviewing the proposal to provide for a national park on Cape Cod, I find that the rights of the permanent residents are afforded a maximum degree of protection; that a large portion of the cape will still remain unaffected and available for private and commercial developments. It is this balanced approach, affording maximum consideration for established communities yet with a realistic regard for the future purpose and function that the Cape Cod area will serve to our future population that makes the establishment of a national park so necessary. The fact that uncoordinated and ill-conceived commercial activities have been occurring at an accelerated pace emphasizes the urgency for prompt passage of this bill.

GERALD SILVERMAN, Ph. D.

SPENCER & STONE,
COUNSELLORS AT LAW,
Boston, December 6, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: A letter from two interested M.I.T. people about the proposed Cape Cod National Park bill suggests that I write to you. I shall not be able to appear in Eastham on the 16th or 17th of this month. I am enclosing a little statement which you may use as you see fit.

Very truly yours,

J. SIDNEY STONE.

DECEMBER 6, 1960.

For years one of my relatives was a very enthusiastic visitor on the outer side of the cape. One of his camps was washed away. Much later, after a thorough investigation of various sites, he built a camp on the outer bluff or cliff next to the place where the Marconi wireless station was years ago. At a still later time he bought the old site of the Marconi station. I visited him there many times. He visited there at times every month of the year, as long as he was able. Ultimately the military authorities took over the camp which is on the outer edge of the antiaircraft reservation at South Wellfleet mostly on the flat land just south of the location of his camp. I have walked much of the cliffs in all that area, and most heartily believe that if all the land which has not now been utilized for summer homes along the outer edge of the cape could be taken as a national park it would be a great thing for the future. At present the military reservation is used only, I believe, by the National Guard. If that was ever given up, the park might well run from the southerly side thereof not far north from Nauset Light.

Then I would hope that they would take as much as possible of the outer edge where not yet fully developed, taking back land that would make it contiguous for a large part of the way from there to Highland Light.

I cannot imagine any place that is more worth preserving.

J. SIDNEY STONE.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *December 5, 1960.*

Congressman WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: As people who believe fervently in the conservation and preservation of the natural beauties of the cape as envisioned in the plan for the Cape Cod National Seashore, my wife and I protest the present unscrupulous activities of some of the opponents to this program. Because no serious attempt was made to assure retroactive provisions of the proposed law establishing the park, certain individuals have deliberately set out to ignore conservation and to turn the delay to their personal gain.

If the plans of the originators of this conservation program are not to deteriorate almost totally and if the efforts of those who have ardently supported the park proposal are not to be lost, then the Department of the Interior should act quickly and forcefully. Steps must be taken to stop real estate promoters and unscrupulous landowners from taking advantage of the lapse in time prior to enactment of legislation establishing the park.

Unless positive action is taken quickly and forcefully, the entire program for conservation of this beautiful natural resource for the benefit of all of the people might just as well be forgotten.

As property owners in Truro, we trust that your committee and the Congress will act quickly and positively. We submit this for the record because business will not permit us to appear personally at the forthcoming hearing in Eastham.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE C. TENNEY.

FALMOUTH, MASS.,
December 16, 1960.

Representative WAYNE H. ASPINALL,
Eastham Town Hall, Eastham, Mass.:

I wish to state that I am personally unalterably opposed to proposed national seashore park on Cape Cod.

JOHN P. SYLVIA, Jr.,
Attorney.

THE TRUSTEES OF RESERVATIONS,
MILTON, MASS., *December 9, 1960.*

Hon. WAYNE ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: I herewith present a copy of resolutions adopted by the members of the corporation of the Trustees of Reservations at their annual meeting held in Boston, Mass., on January 28, 1959, as an indication of our interest in support of the proposal for the Cape Cod National Seashore Park to be presented at the hearing scheduled for December 16 and 17 at the Town Hall in Eastham, Mass.

Sincerely yours,

LORING CONANT, *Executive Secretary.*

RESOLUTIONS OFFERED BY CHARLES W. ELIOT AT THE ANNUAL MEETING, TRUSTEES OF RESERVATIONS, JANUARY 1959

I. PROPOSED NATIONAL PARKS AND HISTORIC DISTRICTS

Whereas the Massachusetts Trustees of Reservations were established by act of the General Court in 1891 for the "purpose of acquiring, holding, arranging, maintaining, and opening to the public under suitable regulations, beautiful and historical places and tracts of land within this Commonwealth"; and

1. Cape Cod National Park

Whereas one of the first actions of this new corporation in 1891 was to petition the General Court "that the province lands upon Cape Cod stand in need of more efficient management," and asking prompt action to "preserve for the use and enjoyment of the people of the Commonwealth, their only great oceanside domain"; at the request of the General Court, the trustees prepared a report in 1892 which led to the adoption of legislation the following year and established the first unit of the great beach reservation as advocated by Henry Thoreau over 100 years ago; and

Whereas the National Park Service, after an investigation of all possibilities for preservation of remaining natural seashore areas along the Atlantic coast has recommended a national seashore park on the Great Beach of Cape Cod, and legislation (H.R. 3030) has been introduced in Congress for the establishment of the Cape Cod National Park;

2. Minute Man National Historical Park

Whereas in 1939, with the help of the Emerson family and other friends, the trustees were enabled to acquire and preserve the Old Manse and eight acres adjoining the Concord battleground of 1775 at the Old North Bridge, and now maintain the reservation through an active local committee; and

Whereas the Boston National Historic Sites Commission, after 2 years of study and research, has issued a report on "The Lexington-Concord Battle Road" with recommendations for establishment of a national historical park in two units (a) along the battle road between Route 128 and Meriam's Corner, and (b) at the North Bridge including the Old Manse, and for negotiations of "cooperative agreements with local government, societies and other property owners wherever feasible to insure the continued preservation and facilitate the interpretation of significant sites and structures both inside and outside the units specifically proposed"; and legislation (H.R. 1932) has been introduced in Congress for the establishment of the Minute Man National Historical Park; and

Whereas the Governor of the Commonwealth has recommended the establishment of historic districts for the protection and preservation of historic sites, and legislation (H.R. 2185) is now before the General Court to authorize cities and towns to establish such districts: Be it

Resolved, That the Trustees of Reservations, at the annual meeting of the corporation held on January 28, 1959, welcome the interest and action of the National Park Service, the Boston National Historic Sites Commission, the Congress of the United States, the Governor and General Court of the Commonwealth in the work of preserving the beautiful and historical places of Massachusetts; enthusiastically endorse the proposed Cape Cod National Park, the Minute Man National Historical Park and the establishment of historic districts; and pledge the interest and support of the trustees in the continuing effort to preserve for public enjoyment these and other beautiful and historical places within the Commonwealth; and be it further,

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the members of the Massachusetts delegation in the Congress, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Director of the National Park Service, the Boston National Historic Sites Commission, Governor Furcolo and the committee on state administration of the General Court.

II. PROPOSED STATE PARKS AND FORESTS AND THE BAY CIRCUIT

Whereas the Massachusetts Trustees of Reservations have, since their establishment in 1891, urged upon and cooperated with all agencies of the Commonwealth in securing and maintaining public open spaces, initiated and supported the establishment of the Boston Metropolitan Parks (1892; ch. 407 of 1893) and the bay circuit (1926; ch. 631 of 1956), and last year urged "the authorization of a large State park and State forest park loan" (ch. 650 of 1958): Be it

Resolved, That the Trustees of Reservations at the annual meeting of the corporation held on January 28, 1959, urge that the agencies charged with responsibility over the public open spaces of towns, cities, the metropolitan district and the Commonwealth, and an aroused citizenry, to preserve our presently inadequate parks and open spaces against encroachments by buildings and against diversion to other uses; and again call attention to the need for immediate action in the face of our exploding urban areas for the acquisition and preservation of extensive areas for the recreation and enjoyment of the people—and particularly in the bay circuit in the most rapidly growing section of the State—before the beauty and quality of such areas are destroyed forever; and be it further,

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor, the commissioners of natural resources and the metropolitan district, and appropriate committees of the General Court.

WOODS HOLE, MASS., *December 14, 1960.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN PFOST: I write to strongly support the creation of the National Seashore Park of Cape Cod.

As a property owner in Eastham as well as Woods Hole where I was born, a summer resident for 74 years and a year-around resident since 1952, I feel entitled to register my approval of the park.

Having personally traveled through many national parks of the country from east to west, I appreciate their worth to the whole Nation for conservation and recreation.

You must act at this moment while we have the opportunity to add this unique area to the national park chain.

We look to the House and Senate to confirm the passage of the necessary legislation.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY F. MIXTER,
Mrs. Wm. Jason Mixter.

WESTFIELD RIVER WATERSHED ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Woronoco, Mass., December 5, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: The Westfield River Watershed Association, a privately financed and nonprofit organization devoted to the development and conservation of natural resources, wishes to record itself again as favoring the establishment of a national seashore park at Cape Cod.

The historical significance of the area warrants its becoming a part of our national park system; it is in the public interest to maintain that part of the cape in its natural state and to protect against the encroachment of private development.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD F. R. MASON, Jr., *President.*

WHEELER & TAYLOR, INC.,
Great Barrington, Mass., December 12, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Department of Natural Resources, 15 Ashburton Place, Boston, Mass.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: While Cape Cod is at the other end of the State from Berkshire County, possibly we appreciate the cape more than some residents nearby. We like to visit there at every opportunity because it is entirely different from our beautiful hills. It is this comparison that makes the two most interesting areas in the State.

When I first read about the possibility of the national park on the cape I was at once enthusiastic, largely because in the 50 years since I have been visiting the cape it has depreciated greatly—too much building, signboards, gas stations, etc. To preserve for all time the area now designated would in my opinion be one of the outstanding steps taken in many, many years looking toward the future protection of land for public use.

I haven't visited all national parks in this country, but most of them. I have not only been impressed with the parks themselves but with the warden service and the continued use of these wonderful properties by an ever-increasing number of individuals. The development of these areas by our Government is to my mind one of the best things ever done for the people of this country. Please don't let the wonderful possibility for taking the area at Cape Cod pass by. This may be but a feeble protest but I am sure there are thousands more who are hoping, as I am, that we can visit this national park in the not too distant future.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT K. WHEELER.

NORTH EASTHAM, MASS., *December 10, 1960.*

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to Senate bill No. 2636 for the establishment of a Cape Cod National Seashore Park, I address you again as a year-round resident and taxpayer and property owner of Eastham on Cape Cod who is entirely in favor of the proposed park as set forth now in the aforementioned bill.

Three facts are in my mind as the time for the December 16 and 17 hearing arrives.

Fact No. 1: Since the last two hearings (Senate), one in Eastham and one in Washington, the 1960 census figures have been announced indicating a great population increase in this country, a trend that is labeled population explosion. This is one added important reason that I think the Cape Cod National Seashore Park should be established quickly. If this area is not preserved now it soon will be swallowed up. And the thicker the population, the more need for just this type of preserved wilderness area where human beings can go for recreation.

Fact No. 2: As mentioned to you in my letter of August 5, 1960, the commercial inroads into this area are sickening—but now still more so. Developers are cutting into the pristine beauty of Cape Cod at an ever increasing rate. The need now is for speed to get the park a reality before Cape Cod becomes just another suburban area linked to the big cities as it is with better and better roads.

Fact No. 3: It is my opinion that a great many people who live off-Cape think that most people who live here do not want the park. They are led to think this because the noise made by the smaller number of opponents is so great. Actually there are many more of us here who want the park than there are those who don't want it.

Now how about some good honest romanticism? Wouldn't it do us all good if we could stop being so mercenary, so eternally grasping with every breath we draw? What this country needs are more places like a Cape Cod National Seashore Park, open country, open seashore, open to all who seek to get close to nature and perhaps closer to some of life's true values. There is little seashore area left in the East where this is possible. If we don't have the park we soon will see the end of this open country here; it will be jammed tight with suburbanism and commercialism.

I hope you and your committee will do all in your power to have this park legislation passed at the earliest possible moment. Ride like Hell and don't spare the horses.

Thank you for your help in putting first things first for the good of the great majority of Americans.

Sincerely,

HAROLD D. WHITE.

TRURO, MASS., *December 10, 1960.*

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ASPINALL: My husband and I wish to go on record as being completely in favor of the Cape Cod National Park as originally proposed. Our house in which we have lived since 1923 is in the midst of the original bounds of the park, on South Pamet Road, Truro, and we are not at all in favor of being left out of the park as per the latest plan of the selectmen with I gather the blessing of Congressman Keith.

The opposition to the park, which will try to pressure you at the forthcoming meeting in Eastham, is being fomented by real estate interests or ignorant land holders who are against any authority, be it the Federal Government or town zoning regulations. The more forward-looking landowners who have bought homes in this area for retirement are almost all in favor of the original park idea. Many of these people are professionals, some with national reputations who unfortunately are not here at this time.

Any argument that there will be no land left for our young people to build on is fallacious, the real obstacle is the price of real estate in Truro which has been inflated beyond reason.

All along, the representatives of the citizens of Truro at hearings on the Cape Cod National Park have been avowed opponents of any park at all. Two of our selectmen favor the park but under great pressure have come up with a compromise which we hope the Department of the Interior will reject and that the bill will pass as proposed by the park department.

Respectfully yours,

DOROTHY R. WILSON.
E. A. WILSON.

BOSTON, MASS., *December 12, 1960.*

Re proposed National Park, Cape Cod, Mass.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: For several years I have been extremely interested in the legislation that has been pending in the Congress for the establishment of a National Park on Cape Cod. Congressman Philip J. Philbin has been most helpful in providing me information on this matter.

The arguments in favor of this legislation have been spoken many times, so I shall only add my voice to those who urge you to act favorably and promptly to create this National Park. The cape is a national attraction as any summer visitor or resident will attest. I do not feel that it is in the best interest of the country to allow private interests to acquire this land that would be of great value to all the people.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. ADAMS.

(COMMITTEE NOTE.—Numerous other communications have been made a part of the committee file.)

○